

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Vol. LIX, 4

Whole No. 236

THE NEW INSCRIPTION OF THE SALAMINIOI.

A most lucky find of the Agora excavations in 1936 was an undamaged stele containing the record of an arbitration of the Attic year 363/2 B. C. between the two branches of the γένος of the Salaminioi, οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἐπτά φυλῶν and οἱ ἀπὸ Σουνίου, and an enumeration of the cults practiced by this genos. The inscription was published with a very full and learned commentary by Professor Ferguson in the last report on the Agora excavations.¹ The editor has well brought out the point, proved by the name of the genos, that it is not a real *gens*, held by bonds of kinship, and also the interesting fact that it was split up into two halves. The reason of this splitting up was, apparently, that a large part of the genos was concentrated at Sounion while the other members were dispersed over seven phylai. The compact mass of the genos living at Sounion may have tried to reserve the sacrifices and other privileges for itself; against this tendency the dispersed members organized themselves as an opposition party. The litigation was ended for the moment by the arbitration in question, but finally each of the two halves became a separate genos, as a second inscription from about 250 B. C. proves. The Salaminioi were in reality a cult association which posed as a genos, one of the kind which Solon equalized with the *gentes*.²

¹ W. S. Ferguson, "The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion," *Hesperia*, VII (1938), p. 1.

² This is the purpose of the anonymous law that the phrateres are obliged to receive the orgeones, viz. the cult associations, as well as the ὁμογάλακτας, οὓς γεννήτας καλοῦμεν, Philochoros in Harpokration, s. v. ἑργεῶνες, etc. The law cannot belong to Kleisthenes, as says G. Busolt, *Griech. Staatskunde*³, p. 252, for this is at variance with the statement of Aristoteles, *pol. Ath.*, 21, that he allowed every one to retain the

The editor discusses at length the connection of the *genos* of the Salaminioi with the conquest of the island of Salamis by the Athenians, but it seems to be possible to advance this interesting problem further. Of course the old decree concerning Salamis by the Athenian people³ comes into one's mind. It is badly mutilated and has been much discussed; Professor Wilhelm proved long ago that the preserved sentences do not refer to the Athenian *klerouchs* in Salamis but to the old inhabitants who were allowed to remain in the island, subject to Athens.⁴ The important point is that Athenian *klerouchs* were settled in Salamis, one of whom was Timodemos in whose honour Pindar composed the second Nemean ode.⁵ I shall not enter into a protracted discussion of the struggle of Athens for the possession of Salamis; on the whole Professor Beloch treated it correctly,⁶ according to my opinion. I wish only to stress that the struggle was a long one with several vicissitudes. It was ended by the arbitration of the Spartans which took place not in the time of Solon, as the ancient authors say,⁷ but after the expulsion of the tyrants by the Spartans; the Kleomenes mentioned is of course, as Beloch states, the king who was at the head of the expedition's forces.⁸ Some time earlier, probably in the beginning of the reign of Peisistratos, Athens had conquered Salamis. No state submits to an arbitration after a victorious war, unless it is imposed by mightier states, and there is no trace of such a situation at that time. But the defeated state may take a favourable opportunity to propose its claims, and such an opportunity seemed to the Megarians to have come when the Spartans, of

phratries and the priesthoods according to the custom of the ancestors. The law wears the stamp of Solon who had much regard for the *orgeones*; they were mentioned in his *δξῶνες*, Seleukos, *loc. cit.*; cf. the law in Gaius, *Digesta*, 4, 7, 22, 4.

³ *IG*, I², 1 = Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 13.

⁴ *Athen. Mitt.*, XXIII (1898), p. 471.

⁵ *Schol. Pind. Nem.*, II, 19, τῶν τὴν Σαλαμίνα κατακληρουχισάντων Ἀθηναίων; cf. Pausanias, I, 40, 5.

⁶ K. J. Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*², I: 2, p. 309. The only doubtful point is the reconquest by the Megarians about 550 B. C. If it took place it must have been of brief duration.

⁷ Plutarch, *Solon*, 10; cf. Aelian, *Var. hist.*, VII, 19.

⁸ The decree mentioned above is probably to be referred to a regulation after the Spartan arbitration; the script proves that it belongs to the end of the sixth century B. C.

whose league Megara was a member, had laid their hands on Athens, expelling Hippias. On the other hand the Athenians may have had valid reasons, other than the Homeric verses cited by Plutarch, to proffer for their possession of the island. The question is what had happened in the meantime.

We know that Athenian klerouchs were settled in Salamis, and it is most probable that the settling took place soon after the first conquest of the island. For precisely at this moment means were needed in order to secure the grip of the Athenians on the newly conquered territory and to maintain its loyalty to Athens. We do not know how the lands allotted to the klerouchs were procured and may perhaps suppose unreflectingly the usual method of expelling the old inhabitants, but there is another way, an exchange of inhabitants and property, and the peculiar interest of our inscription is that it seems to prove that this way was resorted to. For the fact that a great many Salaminians moved to Attica, that a compact mass of them were settled in one place at Sounion, and that they were organized as a *genos* cannot possibly be explained as the result of a voluntary migration. At this time the Athenians were not so jealous of their citizenship as the democracy of the fifth century B. C. was, a fact for which it had to pay by the ruin of its empire. The thesis which I wish to propose for consideration is that such an exchange really took place. Athenian klerouchs were settled in Salamis; a number of Salaminians were transferred to Attica, received citizenship and property in exchange for that which was given to the Athenian klerouchs. A compact mass was settled at Sounion, where for some reason it was possible to give over a vast tract of land to the Salaminians, while others were dispersed over Attica so that later on they came to belong to seven *phylai*. Such politics are not unparalleled in ancient times; they remind one of the Roman manner of receiving the most prominent men of the Latin towns and colonies into the body of citizens. Herodotus (V, 57) says that the Gephyraei went from Eretria to Tanagra, from there to Athens, and that they received Athenian citizenship.

What strikes the reader who is conversant with the sacral organization is the fact that the Athenian state contributed to the sacrifices offered by the Salaminioi, ll. 20: ὅσα μὲν ἡ πόλις παρέχει ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἢ παρὰ τῶν ὠσκοφόρων ἢ παρὰ τῶν δειπνοφόρων

γίγνεται λαμβάνειν Σαλαμινίους. This is, as far as my knowledge goes, unexampled. The state paid for the public sacrifices offered by the priests and procured by the magistrates. Many cults belonging originally to certain *gentes* had been made public; the state did not pay for these but allowed the priests, taken from the *gentes*, certain emoluments deriving from the sacrifices. In every case it is a striking exception for the state to pay for sacrifices offered by a *genos*. But in this case it was apparently an old custom too. We read l. 87: *ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ οἷς ἡ πόλις δίδωσιν ἐκ κύρβεων*. The archaic word *κύρβις* seems to prove that the prescription was derived from the sixth century B. C., even if it is impossible to refer it to the Solonian *κύρβεις* which according to some authors contained his sacral laws.⁹ There must have been a strong reason why this exceptional favour was granted to the Salaminioi, i. e. to connect them closely with the Athenian state, and we shall see that this purpose is apparent in their cults too.

These cults are in many respects most interesting. Some of them were transferred from Salamis to Attica. So was the hero Eurysakes, the son of Aias, of whom the editor treats exhaustively (p. 16). He was a late, post-Homeric creation, with a cult in Salamis itself and a hieron in Melite in the city of Athens, the very place where our inscriptions were found. The editor has well brought out the point that the founding of this hieron must be earlier than the creation of the Kleisthenian phyle Aiantis which set up its records in the Eurysakeion. I think that this hieron of Eurysakes represents the first step of the Athenians on their way to win Salamis. When they wished to conquer Aegina the oracle counselled them to assign a *temenos* to Aias,¹⁰ of course in order to draw the hero of the island over to themselves. In the struggle for Salamis they may have assigned a *temenos* to the hero of this island, Eurysakes, for the same purpose. The outcome is the legend that the sons of Aias, Eurysakes and Philaios, moved to Attica and received Athenian citizenship, Eurysakes settling in Melite and Philaios at Brauron.¹¹ This legend is a projection into mythology of the means

⁹ Suidas, s. v., and others.

¹⁰ Herodot., V, 89.

¹¹ Plutarch, *Solon*, 10. Herodot., VI, 35, Pherekydes from Athens, fr. 2 Jacoby, and Pausanias, I, 35, 2, mention Philaios only, the eponym

by which the Athenians tried to fuse Salamis with their state, that is, by founding the Eurysakeion and by granting Athenian citizenship to the Salaminians who settled in Attica, and the legend served in the future to assert their claims on Salamis. The last and crowning event was that an Attic phyle was named after Aias himself.

From Salamis also came the cult of Athena Skiras at Phaleron (Ferguson, p. 18), which was connected with the festival of the Oschophoria. Professor Deubner has given voice to the opinion that the Oschophoria belonged virtually to Dionysos, not to Athena Skiras,¹² which is disproved by our inscription. Thereby a new question is raised. Were the Oschophoria brought from Salamis together with the cult of Athena Skiras, or are they an old Attic festival which was connected with this goddess only when she was introduced and her temple at Phaleron founded? The latter alternative seems to be more probable. The Oschophoria appear in the inscription as a gentile festival of the Salaminioi; their archon, designated by lot, appointed the ὠσχοφόροι and δειπνοφόροι together with the priestess and the herald, according to ancestral custom (ll. 47). If the state contributed to the costs of this festival, it seems to be most probable that it was an old Attic festival the care of which was handed over to the Salaminioi. It seems to be relevant that the aetiological legends of the festival apply to Theseus and not to the Salaminian heroes worshipped at Phaleron. Even the heroes Phaiax and Nauseiros to whom, together with Poseidon Hippodromios and Teukros, the Salaminioi sacrificed in Boedromion (l. 91), are incorporated into the Theseus legend.¹³ The Salaminioi performed a sacrifice to Theseus on the sixth of Pyanepsion (l. 92), two days before the state festival in his honour.

Most astonishing is that the Salaminioi furnished the priest-

of the famous house to which Miltiades belonged. Since Miltiades the elder was a contemporary of Peisistratos, it is hard to believe that his family had immigrated from Salamis. The Philaidai were an old Attic gens settled at Brauron, which played a great part as early as the beginning of the sixth century (Hippokleides); perhaps it had earlier connexions with Salamis, but we do not know how and why its connexion with Aias came about. It is, however, a piece of the same web.

¹² L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, p. 142.

¹³ Philochoros in Plutarch, *Theseus*, 17, who says Nausithoos instead of Nauseiros; cf. Ferguson, p. 24.

esses of Aglauros and Pandrosos and of Kourotrophos (ll. 12 and 45); these two cults appear together in an ephebe inscription also.¹⁴ Both cults are located on the slopes of the Acropolis. Kourotrophos usually appears alone; her identification with Ge is late. Aglauros and Pandrosos belong to the native stratum of Athenian cults and myths. Their myth is connected with the old-fashioned rite of the Arrephoria. In the hieron of Pandrosos which joined the Erechtheum grew the holy olive tree. The ephebes took the oath of loyalty to the state in the hieron of Aglauros.¹⁵ It is really astonishing that the priestess of this old cult was taken from the *genos* of the Salaminioi which had only recently immigrated and it shows the great price set upon their allegiance. We do not know how it was possible. If originally, as do most old cults, this cult belonged to some family, the family must have become extinct.

On the other hand the Salaminioi showed their loyalty to Athens by sacrificing to Athena at the Panathenaea (l. 88) as well as to Theseus. This reminds one of the duty imposed on the colony of Brea, and probably other colonies too, of sending a panhoply to the Panathenaea and a phallos to the great Dionysia.¹⁶ The tokens of their belonging to the citizen body are their sacrifices to Zeus Phratrios at the Apatouria (l. 92) and to Apollo Patroos on the seventh of Metageitnion (l. 89). Professor Ferguson estimated these cults justly; they are not common to all *gene*, as is often said (p. 31), but it may be possible to elucidate this matter somewhat more. In the *dokimasia* of the archons they were asked if they had an Apollo Patroos and a Zeus Herkeios and where these and their tombs were;¹⁷ the *γεννηται* of Apollo Patroos and Zeus Herkeios are said to testify to the citizenship.¹⁸ The purpose is to ascertain the citizenship. In the old times when no citizen rolls existed the simplest means of proving it was the possession of family tombs, property, and a house, in religious terms a Zeus Herkeios, whose altar was in the court-yard, and an Apollo Agyieus before the doors. Both were inherited from the ancestors and for this

¹⁴ *IG*, II², 1039, l. 58.

¹⁵ Demosthenes, *de falsa leg.*, XIX, 303 and the scholia.

¹⁶ *IG*, I², 45 = Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 67, ll. 13; cf. 63, l. 57.

¹⁷ Aristot., *pol. Athen.*, 55; cf. Harpokration, *s. v.* 'Ερκεῖος Ζεὺς.

¹⁸ Demosthenes, LVII, 67.

reason Apollo was called πατρώος. This epithet does not imply that the pedigree was carried back either to Zeus or to Apollo. On the contrary the noble families had their own heroic ancestors. Whosoever belonged to "the people without ancestors" and did not possess landed property had neither a Zeus Herkeios nor an Apollo Patroos. When the supremacy of the landed gentry was broken and the common people were admitted to a part in state affairs, some change became necessary in regard to proving citizenship. The phrateres who were charged with the supervision took over the gods who were invoked in testimony of citizenship. Zeus and Apollo became gods of the phratries which instituted cults for them. So the small people too, viz. the members of the cult associations, who inherited the name of γεννηται, got their Zeus Herkeios and Apollo Patroos.¹⁹ Zeus was generally renamed Phratrios. Apollo Patroos became the ancestor of all Athenians at a relatively late time, being identified with Apollo Pythios, the father of Ion, a myth which is well known from the *Ion* of Euripides. And we read in fact that the Salaminioi made a sacrifice to Ion too (l. 87). It is apparent that the group of gods to whom the sacrifice of the seventh of Metageitnion was offered—Apollo Patroos, Leto, Artemis, and Athena ἀγελάα—is a conventional one. Athena also appears sometimes as Phratia and I agree with Professor Ferguson (p. 29) that in this connexion the epithet is to be understood as "the leader of the people."

Here we have found a conventional group of gods belonging to the common mythology. There is another. The Herakleion was the chief sanctuary of the Sounian Salaminioi and the income of the genos was drawn from its lands. The cult was certainly old, for Herakles was very popular in Attica, but to Herakles are added his mother Alkmene and his true friend Iolaos. This connexion is not unexampled in Attika,²⁰ but their addition to the cult of Herakles is obviously of mythological origin. To these are added Kourotrophos, Maia, and

¹⁹ Cf. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*², 991, Διὸς Ἐπελο Πατρῶο (from Galepsos) and *Revue archéol.*, IX (1935), p. 135, Διὸς Κρησίο Πατρῶο (from Thasos).

²⁰ Alkmene and Iolaos had a common altar in Kynosarges and Herakles and Hebe as well, Pausanias, I, 19, 3; Alkmene and Hebe in the deme of Aixone, *IG*, II², 1199.

three local heroes. The group may in part be explained through the wish to include as many of the cults as possible in this festival which was the chief festival of the Sounian Salaminioi. Therefore the three nameless heroes were added and so too it may be understood that Kourotrophos is added. But why Maia? I fail to understand what the mother of Hermes has to do here and I venture to ask if *μαῖα* is not to be understood in the literal sense of mother or nurse. The three local heroes call for some comment. *ἥρως ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλῇ* is rightly interpreted (p. 54) as the hero of the salt-works; the two others are named from unknown localities. My point is further to stress the prodigious number of local, unnamed heroes exemplified here as well as in the sacrificial calendar of the Tetrapolis.²¹ There were many of them throughout the country-side, more than the small chapels in modern Greece, and only by a steadfast regard for this fact can the vigour of the hero cult be comprehended.

The two groups of gods last discussed are conventional, a sign that these cults are of relatively late creation; the phratry gods are also conventional. This is interesting inasmuch as we can see how the cults of a cult association in the middle of the sixth century B. C. were created. Much more interesting are, however, the Attic cults attached to the *genos* of the Salaminioi and the Salaminian cults transferred to Attica. That mythology served as a means of politics is well known and often mentioned, though it is to be regretted that the materials never have been collected and treated comprehensively. Mythological claims served for the Greek states the same purpose as national claims in our days. We have seen an example in the legend that the sons of Aias emigrated to Attica. It has been less noticed that the cults too were used for political purposes, especially in fusing the petty states of Attica into a unity—the state of Athens.²²

A filial cult of Artemis at Brauron was founded on the

²¹ *IG*, II², 1358 = von Prott, *Fasti sacri*, 26; four pairs of a hero and a heroine, and two heroes more; most of these are nameless, one is called *ἥρως Φηραίος*, another *ἥρως ἐν .ρασιλείαι*.

²² This point of view was emphasized by Wide in Gercke-Norden, *Einl. in die klass. Altertumswiss.*, I², p. 218 (the passage is left out in the third and fourth editions). The materials are collected by S. Solders, *Die ausserstädtischen Kulte und die Einigung Attikas*, Dissertation, Lund, 1931, but the relevant points are not well brought out.

Acropolis of Athens and a gay procession went every fourth year from Athens to Brauron to the great festival there.²³ The Thesmophoria of Halimus were added to those of Athens as their first day, which explains why the third day was called ἡ μέση.²⁴ Peisistratos brought Dionysos Eleuthereus to Athens from the village of Eleutherai in the borderland of Boeotia. This fact is most noticeable in regard to the Eleusinian mysteries because we know that Eleusis was incorporated into the Athenian state relatively late; at the end of the seventh century B. C. Athens took care of the mysteries although the celebrations were allowed to remain with the old Eleusinian families. An Eleusinion was founded in the city below the Acropolis; the holy things were yearly brought to Athens only in order to be carried back again to Eleusis in the solemn Iacchos procession. It has been guessed that the original intention was to transfer the mysteries to Athens.²⁵

In the light of these examples, which show how the transference of cults was used in order to unite conquered territories with Athens, the cult regulations of our inscription can be better understood. Their purpose was to unite Salamis and the Salaminians with Athens. Therefore Eurysakes received a sanctuary at Athens and Athena Skiras was transferred to Phaleron. But in this case the Athenians went further. They transplanted part of the inhabitants of Salamis to Attica—probably the well-to-do families, for there are many well-known men among the Salaminioi. In order to attach them to the Athenian state they not only gave them citizenship but also handed over to them old Attic cults and assigned to them means for their performance. In order to be able to maintain the cults, the Salaminioi were organized as a new *genos*, viz. cult association. The Athenians must have been very anxious to win the favour of the Salaminians, and they succeeded. Their claims were definitely recognized and Salamis remained in their hands. Thus this inscription sheds light on much-discussed events in the politics of Athens in the sixth century B. C.

MARTIN P. NILSSON.

LUND UNIVERSITY, SWEDEN.

²³ Aristot., *pol. Athen.*, 57; Aristophanes, *Pax*, 873.

²⁴ See Nilsson, *Griech. Feste*, p. 317.

²⁵ *Archaeol. Jahrbuch*, XXXI (1916), p. 313.

PLATO'S EPIGRAM ON DION'S DEATH.

The elegiac poem of six lines which Plato is said to have written on the death of Dion of Syracuse¹ provides an interesting example of the inability of scholars to agree on what looks like a simple issue. Of its authenticity two contrary views are current. The one is represented by Wilamowitz, who treated the poem as the genuine work of Plato, written when he heard the news of Dion's death, and said of it: "Noch einmal, ein letztes Mal, zwang ihn die Muse, sein Gefühl unmittelbar in einem Gedichte ausströmen zu lassen."² Indeed to Wilamowitz its authorship seemed so clear that he did not argue about it but stated it as an obvious fact. On the other hand A. E. Taylor, though admitting some uncertainty, tends to hold that the lines are not by Plato and bases his case on their contents which seem to him unsuitable for a man of seventy.³ Between these two positions comes that of Reitzenstein, who, after some scepticism about all the Platonic epigrams,⁴ came to accept some at least as genuine, but felt that in this case a "clumsy beginning" had been prefixed to a genuine last line.⁵ There seems, then, some reason for considering the poem again and for asking whether Plato did or did not write it.

The poem is quoted by Diogenes Laertius, III, 30 and by the *Palatine Anthology*, VII, 99, both of whom refer it to the philosopher Plato. Its first two lines are quoted by Suidas, and its last line by Apuleius (*Apol.*, 10). All four authorities may be using what is ultimately the same source, and the question arises what this is. The text of Diogenes provides a simple answer. The two epigrams on Aster (Nos. 4 and 5, Diehl), which he quotes immediately before it, come from the work of "Aristippus" *Περὶ παλαιᾶς τρυφῆς*, and it looks as if this poem came from the same source. This has been questioned by M. Boas,⁶ who, basing his case on the rough methods by which Diogenes assembled his materials from different sources, argues that this poem came from Meleager's *Garland*. He is certainly

¹ No. 6, Diehl. I am indebted to Mr. D. L. Page for helpful criticism, though he must not be assumed to accept my conclusions.

² *Platon*, I, p. 644. For a similar view cf. R. v. Scheliha, *Dion*, p. 84.

³ *Plato, the Man and his Work*, p. 554.

⁴ *Epigramm und Skolion*, pp. 181-186.

⁵ Pauly-Wissowa, *R. E.*, VI, 1, p. 90.

⁶ *De Epigrammatis Simonideis*, pp. 121-124.

right in assuming that some of the other epigrams, notably Nos. 9 and 11, cannot have come from "Aristippus," and the text of Diogenes is made considerably smoother if we omit the poem on Dion and pass from the epigrams on Aster to that on Archeanassa. But Diogenes was no artist in the arrangement of his material, and the argument from it cannot be pressed when we look at the words with which he introduces the epigrams,—'Αρίστιππος ἐν τῷ δ' περὶ παλαιᾶς τρυφῆς φησιν αὐτὸν (*sc.* Platona) 'Αστέρος μειρακίου τινὸς ἀστρολογεῖν συνασκειμένου ἐρασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ Δίωνος τοῦ προειρημένου. This surely indicates that the poem on Dion, no less than the poems on Aster, was taken direct from "Aristippus." Against this the use of the words ἀλλὰ καὶ is no argument; for, as J. D. Denniston has shown,⁷ these mean no more than "further," "again," and give no support to any theory of addition from a different source. Moreover, from what we know of "Aristippus" the use of this poem as evidence against Plato's character is exactly what we might expect. He was not concerned with what such poems really meant, but with finding a case against Plato's morals, and for his purpose this poem, and especially its last line, were just the sort of material he liked. Indeed we may see the influence of "Aristippus" in the foolish comment which Diogenes makes after quoting the poem, τοῦτο καὶ ἐπιγέγραφθαι φασὶν ἐν Συρακούσαις ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ. This is not a record of truth, but an interpretation intended to show how amorous Plato was. It seems then fairly certain that the epigram on Dion comes from "Aristippus" and that its authenticity must first be considered with that of other epigrams from the same source, the poems on Aster, Alexis, Archeanassa, and Agathon.

There seems to be no serious objection to the view that in his youth Plato wrote the two epigrams on Aster. But to those on Alexis and Agathon some doubt attaches, because Phaedrus, who is named in the first, and Agathon, to whom the second is addressed, are both characters in Platonic dialogues who are known to have been older than Plato. A. E. Taylor makes the point plain when he says: "To my own mind, the occurrence of the names Agathon and Phaedrus is proof of spuriousness. The author clearly has in mind the parts taken by Agathon the poet and Phaedrus of Myrrhinus in Plato's great ἐρωτικὸς λόγος

⁷ *The Greek Particles*, p. 21.

the *Symposium*, and has forgotten that both were grown men when Plato was under twelve."⁸ To this doubt there is a good answer. It is surely not surprising or improbable that Plato, who spent much of his life writing Dialogues with characters drawn from an older generation than his own, should early have written poetry about the men who belonged to it. He was fascinated by the circle of Socrates and spent his artistic life in recreating it; it is perfectly likely that the impulse which made him put it into his Dialogues asserted itself earlier in making him write poetry about its real or imaginary loves. The poem on Archeanassa is a different matter. For the *Palatine Anthology*, VII, 217 quotes under the name of Asclepiades a four-line epigram on the same subject, in which the first and fourth lines are identical with Plato's, and the second and third show considerable similarities. It is only natural to assume that "Aristippus," eager to prove his malicious case against Plato, used an epigram not written by him and slightly altered it. Against this view, however, there are arguments. Asclepiades was a distinguished poet in his own time, and after his death his works were well known. When "Aristippus" wrote, in the third or second century, it would be difficult to pass off as Plato's lines really written by Asclepiades, and it seems easier to believe that both Plato and Asclepiades wrote lines on the same subject—a proceeding far commoner with the Greeks than with us.

There seems, then, no good reason for denying the epigrams of "Aristippus" to Plato. There are also positive reasons for ascribing them to him. The *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* show that the mature Plato had something of the erotic temperament, and the youthful Plato may have been even more interested in erotic subjects. The identification of the Morning and Evening Star in No. 4 finds a remarkable parallel in *Epinomis* 987b, which must at least be based on Platonic teaching and uses the same star as a symbol of Aphrodite. But better than such arguments is the point made by Reitzenstein that the poems quoted are so good that they cannot be the work of a forger. They are the work of a notable poet, and if they were written by someone else than Plato, it is hard to see why they were not ascribed to him under his proper name. Nor would "Aristippus'" case

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 554.

against Plato have been very convincing if the evidence which he marshalled was not known in some degree to be genuinely Platonic. He seems to have drawn on an oral tradition, perhaps that of the Academy, and in that case his source was good. From a similar source we may trace Plato's epigram on Aristophanes, which is not quoted by Diogenes or the *Palatine Anthology* but known only from the Platonist Olympiodorus (*Vit. Plat.*, I, p. 384). Of it Wilamowitz has well said "Da haben wir vielleicht einen Nachhall der Symposien aus der Akademie,"⁹ and it must be to some such source as this that the genuine epigrams of Plato go back.

Reitzenstein, however, who accepted six other poems as genuine because of their excellence, logically rejected the poem on Dion, or most of it, because he did not think it equally good. So far as it goes, this is a fair argument and deserves consideration. Questions of poetical merit are hard to argue and impossible to prove, and if we follow Reitzenstein's method, the subject must now be closed. But there is another way of tackling the problem. The poem on Dion is concerned with an event of which something is known, and it makes assertions which may be considered historically. It must surely be possible to see what relation these have to what Plato says elsewhere. If they can be shown to be characteristic of him, there is at least a reasonable presumption that the poem was written either by him or by someone better acquainted with his thought than "Aristippus" seems to have been. If Plato wrote it, the poem must come from about the year B. C. 353 when Dion was murdered and Plato was seventy years old. We may then look to see if it bears any relation to his later works and especially to *Epistle VII*, part at least of which seems to have been written at this time and which deals with the whole history of Plato's relations with Dion. The poem would then be later than the *Republic* and earlier than the *Laws*, and any points of resemblance which it may show to either are historically relevant.

The text of the poem presents no difficulties, and may be given as Diehl prints it:

Δάκρυα μὲν Ἑκάβη τε καὶ Ἰλιάδεσσι γυναιξὶ
Μοῖραι ἐπέκλωσαν δὴ τότε γεινομέναις.

⁹ *Hellenistische Dichtung*, I, p. 131.

σοὶ δέ, Δίῳ, ῥέξαντι καλῶν ἐπινίκιον ἔργων
 δαίμονες εὐρείας ἐλπίδας ἐξέχεαν.
 κεῖσθαι δ' εὐρύχρῳ ἐν πατρίδι τίμιος ἀστοῖς,
 ὃ ἐμὸν ἐκμήνας θυμὸν ἔρωτι Δίῳ.

It is at once clear that this is not like any other poem attributed to Plato by "Aristippus" or anyone else. In its general form it seems to resemble the Peloponnesian type of elegiac lament in so far as the dead man is addressed in the second person and the cause of his death specified. As such it recalls the elegiacs of Euripides' *Andromache*, 103-116¹⁰ or the epitaph on the Athenians who fell at Coronea.¹¹ Poems of this type are rare in the fourth or any other century, and the rarity of the form is in itself an argument for Plato's authorship. The form would presumably be used in a society where Dorian customs and manners predominated and would hardly occur to a forger. But in Syracuse in Dion's time it would be thoroughly in place. Syracuse prided itself on its Dorian affinities and kept up the spirit which Pindar had praised to Hieron in *Pythian* I, 61-66 in connection with Etna. Nor was this spirit unknown to Plato. In *Epistle* VII, 336c he tells the friends of Dion to make no use of those men who cannot Δωριστὶ ζῆν κατὰ τὰ πατρία, and the words show that he admired the Dorian traditions of the Syracusans. For such a Dorian society, with its ideals in his memory, Plato himself may well have chosen to write lines on the dead friend who was its champion.

The poem indicates certain circumstances which inspired its composition. Dion has died just at the point when his "broad hopes" seemed near to fulfilment, and in death he is honoured by his townsmen. It happens that both these points are made in *Epistle* VII, which supplies some commentary on them. First, the hopes. These must be Dion's own hopes which seemed likely to be fulfilled at the time when he was murdered. What they were is made clear by *Epistle* VII, 327d, where Plato says of Dion that if he had been able to make what he wanted of Dionysius, μεγάλας ἐλπίδας εἶχεν ἄνευ σφαγῶν καὶ θανάτων καὶ τῶν νῦν γεγενομένων κακῶν βίον ἂν εὐδαίμονα καὶ ἀληθινὸν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ χώρᾳ κατασκευάσαι, and a little later at 328a Plato quotes from the

¹⁰ *Greek Poetry and Life*, pp. 206-230.

¹¹ *Classical Quarterly*, XXXII (1938), pp. 80-88.

message which Dion sent to him when he invited him to Syracuse, and in this were the words εἶπερ ποτὲ καὶ νῦν ἐλπίς πᾶσα ἀποτελεσθήσεται τοῦ τοὺς αὐτοὺς φιλοσόφους τε καὶ πολέων ἄρχοντας μεγάλων συμβῆναι γενομένους. Dion, then, had great hopes of what he might do in Syracuse. Plato knew of them and attached importance to them, and it would be natural in him to lament their collapse when he heard of Dion's death. For they lay near to Plato's own heart in so far as they were concerned with the prospect of establishing philosopher-kings such as he had himself desired in *Republic* VII, 473d. Secondly, the Epistle, like the poem, is concerned with the question of Dion's honours and reputation. No doubt some said that he was a rebel and deserved his death, and to this kind of complaint the poem is in some sense an answer. Dion's townsmen, it says, honour him. So in *Epistle* VII Plato makes a similar point. At 334e he draws a contrast between Dionysius and Dion, the first of whom is leading an ignoble life, while the second, convinced that men ought not to be enslaved, τέθνηκεν καλῶς· τὸ γὰρ τῶν καλλίστων ἐφίεμενον αὐτῷ τε καὶ πόλει πάσχειν ὅτι ἂν πάσχη πᾶν ὀρθὸν καὶ καλόν. Then at 351a Plato says that Dion wished by conferring benefits on the city ἐν δυνάμει καὶ τιμαῖσιν γενέσθαι τὰ μέγιστα ἐν ταῖς μεγισταῖς. The poem after all shows the same idea by indicating that Dion has found in death the honours which he missed in life. Thirdly, the poem shows that Dion fell in his hour of triumph and glory. It gives the impression that there was little time between his victory and his death, which came suddenly and unexpectedly. *Epistle* VII gives the same impression when at 351c it says that Dion ἔπταισεν ἐπ' ἄκρον ἐλθὼν τοῦ περιγενέσθαι τῶν ἐχθρῶν. Here the defeat of his enemies conveys much the same idea as the word ἐπινίκιον in the poem, and his fall is said to come when he has reached the height of success. In these three points the poem and *Epistle* VII agree, and the agreement indicates that the poem was written by someone who knew the situation and saw it very much as Plato knew and saw it when he wrote his letter to Dion's friends.

Nor are the ideas of the poem to be found only in *Epistle* VII among Plato's works. Two points of interest may be noted. First, the notion that Dion is rightly honoured by his fellow-citizens after death accords with what Plato says elsewhere in his Dialogues. At *Republic* VII, 540c he describes the honours

which should await the philosopher who has taken his part in politics; after death he will receive public memorials and sacrifices and be honoured even as a demigod, and certainly as blessed and divine. At *Laws* VII, 802a he repeats the idea, when he says that while it is unsafe to honour living men with songs of praise and hymns, such should be paid to good men after they are dead. Secondly, a Platonic trait may be seen in the use of *δαίμονες* in the third line of the poem. In this we may notice first the use of the plural, secondly the ascription of Dion's death to the external power of *δαίμονες*. Both may be illustrated from Plato's works. Normally, it is true, he uses the singular when he wishes to speak of a single man's destiny (*Rep.* X, 617e, 620d, *Phaed.* 108b), but the poem is concerned with something different from this and uses the plural. A parallel may be found in *Republic* X, 619c, where the man who has made the wrong choice of becoming a tyrant and regrets it, is said οὐ . . . ἐαυτὸν αἰτιάσθαι τῶν κακῶν, ἀλλὰ τύχην τε καὶ δαίμονας καὶ πάντα μᾶλλον ἀνθ' ἐαυτοῦ. Such a man is of course not a Platonic philosopher, but the fact that he blames *δαίμονες* in the plural shows that for Plato this was at least an intelligible and even familiar position. Moreover Plato's own belief that a *δαίμων* could be responsible for evil is shown by *Epistle* VII, 336b, where he describes the earlier failures to establish a good regime in Syracuse and says that the cause was ἢ πού τις δαίμων ἢ τις ἀλιτήριος ἐμπεσὼν ἀνομία καὶ ἀθεότητι καὶ τὸ μέγιστον τόλμαις ἀμαθίας. No doubt he had reason for ascribing such failures to a *δαίμων* rather than to a *θεός*. For him a *θεός* was too high and too good to be the direct cause of evil, and he blamed a power of lower rank.

The agreement of the main thoughts of the poem with Plato's thought at certain places in his Dialogues and in *Epistle* VII may be supplemented by two other points which need some discussion but lead to a similar conclusion. In the third line of the poem Dion is spoken of as ῥέξαντι καλῶν ἐπινίκιον ἔργων. The precise meaning of this is not immediately clear. Wilamowitz's verse-translation renders "Doch du standest im Siegerkranz," and J. M. Edmonds gives "when thou hadst triumphed in the doing of noble deeds." Neither makes quite clear what ἐπινίκιον and ῥέξαντι mean. There seem to be two possible interpretations. Either ἐπινίκιον is used, as often, to mean "triumph-song," and

then *ῥέξαντι* must have some meaning like "having won," and that surely is impossible. Or, *ῥέξαντι* means, as it should, "having made," and *ἐπινίκιον* has an unusual but not impossible meaning of "sacrifice (or feast) in honour of victory." This would give excellent sense, and the only objection is that we should expect the plural *ἐπινίκια*. But the substitution of the singular for the plural seems a legitimate device in poetry and calls for no further comment. If so, this interpretation is easy. In either case the words must refer to the celebration of victory, and the victory consists of good things done. The celebration is not literal but metaphorical. The words, which belong properly to the games, are transferred to politics. For such a use the prose-works of Plato give excellent parallels. At the end of *Republic* X, 621d men who have acted well win rewards *ὥσπερ οἱ νικηφόροι περιγιαυρόμενοι*; at *Laws* V, 730d the good man who helps to maintain order in the city is to be proclaimed *νικηφόρος ἀρετῇ*, and a similar phrase occurs at XII, 953d. The same notion may be seen in the use of *νικητήρια* given to men by the gods in return for good acts at *Republic* X, 613b and *Laws* XII, 964b. These cases show that for Plato the notion of a prize for victory was applied to rewards for well doing, and this is the same idea as in the poem.

Secondly, the remarkable last line of the poem, for which even Reitzenstein felt some tenderness,

ὦ ἔμὸν ἐκμήνας θυμὸν ἔρωτι Δίῳ

is almost intolerable unless it is explained through Plato's own special view of *ἔρως*. If we take it as an ordinary confession of a past love, we can understand why A. E. Taylor says "And it is, perhaps, hardly likely that Plato, writing after he was seventy to a friend who had lived to be over fifty, would use the word *ἔρως* to describe the attachment." It is certainly unlikely,—if *ἔρως* has here its usual meaning. But has it? Is it not much more likely that it has its special Platonic meaning? Plato was deeply attached to Dion, as *Epistle* VII shows, and had expected great things from him. Through him he had hoped to realize his own ideals of a good polity. His attitude towards him seems to correspond very much with what is said about *ἔρως* in the *Symposium*, especially about that kind of *ἔρως* which "engenders wisdom and goodness generally" (209a). There his following words show that this kind of *ἔρως* finds its fruits in

political life—πολὺν δὲ μεγίστη καὶ καλλίστη τῆς φρονήσεως ἢ περὶ τὰ τῶν πόλεων τε καὶ οἰκήσεων διακόσμησις. Just as good results may come to a city from an intense personal attachment, so in the poem Dion is regarded as the object of ἔρωσ through whom Plato had once hoped to realize his ideals. Moreover, the poem regards this love as a kind of madness, and this too is a thoroughly Platonic conception. In *Phaedrus* 253c love is seen as a madness, which is none the less fine and beneficial—προθυμία μὲν οὖν τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐρώντων καὶ τελετή, ἐάν γε διαπράξωνται ὁ προθυμοῦνται, ἧ λέγω, οὕτω καλὴ τε καὶ εὐδαιμονικὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ δι' ἔρωτα μανέντος φίλου τῷ φιληθέντι γίγνεται, ἐὰν αἰρεθῇ. In the Platonic view the lover aims at moulding the object of his love into the image of the god whom both serve, and the affection between them grows with the process, finding its realization in the noble acts which both do together. Nor did Plato in his later years reject this kind of love. In *Laws* VIII, 837c he expressly approves of it in the case of the man who loves another's soul and is seen as τὸ σῶφρον καὶ ἀνδρεῖον καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ τὸ φρόνιμον αἰδούμενος ἅμα καὶ σεβόμενος. If such were his views in old age, there would be no impropriety or improbability in his addressing his dead friend in the language used in the poem.

It seems then that the thoughts of the poem agree well with Plato's own thought as we know it from his Dialogues and *Epistle* VII, and that the poem is hardly intelligible unless we interpret it in the light of Plato's philosophy. This certainly rules out any likelihood of it being a forgery by "Aristippus," who seems to have had very little understanding of what Plato really meant. It also makes it unlikely that some late poet wrote the lines and tried to pass them off as Plato's, rather as Mnascalas wrote in the manner of Simonides. Whoever wrote the poem was thoroughly conversant with the Platonic philosophy and with Plato's own feelings at the death of Dion. The poem is most easily understood if we assume that Plato wrote it in the onslaught of sorrow and disappointment which assailed him at the news of Dion's death, that it gives the first personal and emotional expression of the feelings which he elaborated a little later in *Epistle* VII. It is of course just conceivable that it was not written by Plato himself but by someone else deeply versed in the Platonic literature. But surely this is unlikely. Such a man would have to be a Platonist, even a member of the

Academy, and would be unlikely to claim a poem of his own for Plato, and still more unlikely to use a rare form of lament or to fall into such an echo of the Platonic style as may be seen in the words ἐλπίδας ἐξέχεαν in 4 which recalls *Crito*, 49a, πᾶσαι . . . αἱ πρόσθεν ὁμολογίαι ἐκκεχυμέναι εἰσί. When all is said, Plato seems to be the best candidate for the poem's authorship.

There remain one or two doubts which may roughly be classed as aesthetic and may appeal to those who share Reitzenstein's feeling that the poem is on the whole a poor thing. Such doubts cannot really be set at rest by argument, but some considerations may help to a clearer estimate of their worth. The poem is certainly less polished and less direct than such poems as those on Aster and Agathon. But that is after all to be expected from a man of seventy whose life has been spent on philosophy and who has long ago turned away from the false lures of poetry. It looks as if the poem were written in haste under the stress of a strong emotion, and that would account for such lack of skill as it may show. But it may be surmised that what is claimed as a lack of skill is due simply to Plato following an old literary tradition. This may be seen clearly in the first line where the word μέν is lengthened in arsis before Ἑκάβῃ. To this there is no parallel in the other Platonic epigrams, but there is an explanation of it. The word Ἑκάβῃ had an initial digamma, and this would still be recognized in Syracuse and appropriate to an elegy composed on the Peloponnesian model. In lengthening μέν before an initial digamma at this place in the line Plato does what Homer had done with other words ending in ν when he wrote:

II., V, 836 χειρὶ πάλιν ἐρύσας, ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἐμπαπέως ἀπόρουσεν

IX, 56 οὐδὲ πάλιν ἐρέει· ἀτὰρ οὐ τέλος ἵκεο μύθων

284 γαμβρὸς κέν οἱ ἔοις· τέλει δέ σε ἴσον Ὀρέστη

Plato followed a good precedent, and we cannot reasonably complain or hold the lengthening of μέν in evidence against him.

A more complicated problem lies in the construction and thought of the first four lines. The mention of Hecuba and the Trojan women does not seem very relevant to Dion, even though the contrast is clear between those who are unhappy, as they were, from birth, and others, like Dion, whose joy is turned unexpectedly to sorrow. Perhaps the antithetical arrangement is traditional to this kind of elegy; for the elegiacs of the

Andromache describe first the past, then the present. But there seems to be a better reason for the antithesis than this. The lines are surely a variation on the old theme, ascribed to Solon (Hdt., I, 32), that no man can be called *δαίσιος* until he is dead. The Trojan women never had any illusions about their state, but Dion—like Croesus—may have thought that his happiness would endure. The point was often made both by Sophocles (*Trach.*, 1 ff., *O. T.*, 1529-1530, fr. 646) and by Euripides (*Andr.*, 100 ff., *Tro.*, 510, *Herac.*, 866, *I. A.*, 161). The type of person who was never happy was no subject for tragedy, but the man or woman, like Oedipus or Deianira, who fell from prosperity into ruin, was. Is it not possible that Plato had some such idea in his mind and wished to depict Dion as an essentially tragic figure who fell at the moment of triumph? The fact that he was honoured after death would suit this. For it would place him to some extent in the same company as Aias, Heracles, and Oedipus, who suffered humiliation and death in the hour of pride and were exalted after death to divine or semi-divine honours.

If we view the poem in this light and assume that Plato wrote it, it becomes a document of some relevance for his biography, and it is clear that Wilamowitz was right to attach importance to it. It shows what Plato felt as a man when he saw the final ruin of his hopes for the political life. Before the crisis of Dion's death he had suffered considerable disillusionment about the possibility of establishing a philosophers' state at Syracuse, but, so long as Dion lived, there was still hope. With his murder hope seemed to disappear, and naturally the disappointment was bitter to Plato. He did not live to see the triumph of Timoleon, and he must have died in the conviction that so far as an active political life was concerned, he had failed. Small wonder if he paid a tribute to the man on whom his hopes had rested and saw him as a tragic figure, struck down by implacable supernatural powers in the crisis of success. Poetry was, after all, the simplest and best way to honour Dion's memory, and this epigram, short and strange though it is, well qualifies to be one of those *ἐγκώμια τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς* which Plato himself admitted even into his ideal state.¹²

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD.

C. M. BOWRA.

¹² *Rep.* X, 607a.

THE PENTATHLUM JUMP.

It is well known how highly the Greeks praised the all-round development of the pentathlon for health and comeliness. Thus Aristotle¹ says the pentathletes, because of their strength and agility, were "the handsomest of all athletes," and Galen² called the pentathlon "the most perfect of exercises." Herodotus³ tells how the Elean Tisamenus, later soothsayer for the Spartans at Plataea, was told by the Delphic Pythia that he should be victorious in "five greatest contests," and how he, mistaking the answer, began training for the pentathlon only to be beaten at Olympia.⁴ Iccus of Tarentum, who won in the pentathlon at Olympia in Ol. 76 = 476 B. C., became "the best trainer of his day."⁵ When Hysmon of Elis, an Olympic and Nemean victor, as a boy had a "rheum" settle on his tendons, he practiced the pentathlon "to become sound and healthy."⁶

More than any other contest the pentathlon has aroused controversy among modern writers on ancient athletics over the order of its events and the rules by which victory was decided.⁷

¹ *Rhetoric*, 1361b.

² *De sanitate tuenda*, III, 2.

³ IX, 35. Also Pausanias, III, 11, 6 and cf. VI, 14, 3.

⁴ He was beaten before 479 B. C. Pauly-Wissowa, VIII, col. 1536, wrongly fixes the date Ol. 75 = 480 B. C.

⁵ Pausanias, VI, 10, 5 (statue at Olympia): H. Foerster, *Die Sieger in den Olympischen Spielen* (Progr. des Gymn. zu Zwickau), I-II, 1891, 1892, No. 240. For the strictness of his training, see Plato, *Leg.*, 839e-840a (cf. *Protagoras*, 316d) and Aelian, *De nat. anim.*, VI, 1, and *Var. hist.*, XI, 3. Lucian names him among famous trainers, *Hist. quomodo sit conscribenda*, 35.

⁶ Pausanias, VI, 3, 9 (statue with archaic leaping-weights in the hands, by Cleon of Sicyon) and 10. The date of his Olympic victory lies between Ols. 94-103 = 404-368 B. C.; Foerster, No. 347, p. 26.

⁷ Discussed by J. H. Krause, *Gymnastik u. Agonistik der Hellenen* II, Leipzig, 1841, pp. 476-97; E. Pinder, *Ueber den Fuenfkampf der Hellenen*, Berlin, 1867; A. E. J. Holwerda, "Zum Pentathlon," *Arch. Ztg.*, XXXIX, 1881, pp. 206-16; P. Gardner, "The Pentathlon of the Greeks," *J. H. S.*, I, 1880, pp. 210-23; E. Myers, "The Pentathlon," *ibid.*, II, 1881, pp. 217-21; F. Fedde, *Der Fuenfkampf d. Hellenen*, Gym. Progr. Breslau, 1888, and Leipzig, 1889; M. Faber, "Zum Fuenfkampf d. Griechen," *Philologus*, L, 1891, pp. 469-98; H. Haggenmueller, *Ueber den Fuenfkampf der Hellenen*, Progr. Kgl. Wilhelmshgym., Muenchen, 1892, pp. 1 f. Ph. Legrand, "Quinquertium," in Daremberg-Saglio, pp. 804-07, and "Saltus," *ibid.*, pp. 1054-6.

Of the five events named in the pentameter verse ascribed to Simonides,⁸

ἄλμα ποδωκείην δίσκον ἄκοντα πάλην,

the first, the jump, which was the most prominent, frequently named for the entire contest, and, as Philostratus⁹ says, the most difficult part, has been the subject of wide-spread discussion. This has been due largely to the long records of two early Greek jumpers, Phaëllus of Croton and Chionis of Sparta, the former said to have jumped 55 feet at Delphi, the latter 52 at Olympia. These records have been either rejected as false or, if accepted, interpreted as multiple jumps. But *prima facie* evidence of the reality of the longer one is shown by the fact that it is coupled with a reasonable discus-throw,¹⁰ and repeated by a line of Greek writers of narrative and epigram over a period of centuries. In fact, these three records—the jumps of Phaëllus and Chionis and the discus-throw of the former—are the only ones which have come down to us from the Greek games. This is an excellent indication that the Greeks, unlike us moderns, were interested only in the style in which a contest was performed. Recently unexpected evidence from Aristotle has been adduced by the well-known Austrian writer on ancient athletics, Professor Julius Juethner of the University of Innsbruck. This, in connection with data already known, points conclusively to a

⁸ *Anth. gr. Planud.*, I, 3 (II, p. 527, Dübner); *Greek Anthology, Planud. App.*, Bk. XVI, no. 3, ed. W. R. Paton (London, 1918 [Loeb]), V, p. 158. The five are given in a different order, the foot-race last but one instead of in second place, by scholiasts on Pindar, *Nem.*, I, 35, and Sophocles, *Elect.*, 691, and by Eustathius, *ad Iliad.*, 23, 621. Philostratus, *De re gymnastica* (recently transl. into English by Thos. Woody, reprinted from *The Research Quarterly*, May, 1936, VII, 2), 3, says Jason at Lemnos united the theretofore independent events into a single contest to please Peleus; see Juethner, *Philostratos ueber Gymnastik*, Leipzig, 1909, pp. 198 f. It was introduced at Olympia along with independent wrestling in Ol. 18 = 708 B. C.: Pausanias, V, 8, 7: Philostratus, 12.

⁹ 55.

¹⁰ 28.10 m. or 95 ft. It cannot be compared with modern records, since the size and weight of the ancient discus varied from 3-9 lbs. in metal to over 15 lbs. in stone, while today a standard weight of 2 lbs. is used. Moreover, the method of the ancient throw differed from ours. See E. N. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, Oxford, 1930, pp. 157 f. (with illustrations).

multiple jump. The time is therefore fitting for a review of the material both old and new to show that the long-discussed problem of the Greek jump finally has been solved and the long records in question vindicated. The older evidence was reviewed at length a generation ago in two articles¹¹ by E. Norman Gardiner, the most authoritative English writer on ancient athletics, which we shall frequently quote, showing that he drew wrong conclusions from it.

Phaÿllus' records appear in a late epigram of the Anthology:¹²

πέντ' ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα πόδας πήδησε Φάυλλος·
 δίσκευσεν δ' ἑκατὸν πέντ' ἀπολειπομένων.

Gardiner traced this epigram only as far back as Zenobius, the collector of 552 proverbs in the time of the emperor Hadrian (A. D. 117-138), over six centuries after the victories.¹³ Zenobius thus explains the proverb: ὑπὲρ τὰ ἔσκαμμένα· Φάυλλος ἐγένετο πένταθλος ὁ Πόντιος, ὃς ἐδόκει μέγιστα δισκεύειν καὶ ἄλλεσθαι· ἐπειδὴ οὖν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἔσκαμμένους πεντήκοντα πόδας εἰς τὸ στερεὸν ἤλατο, τὸ συμβὰν εἰς παροιμίαν περιέστη.

That Phaÿllus was no mythical figure is shown by his being mentioned by several Greek writers. Thus Herodotus¹⁴ states that he not only won three victories at Delphi, but later commanded a Crotonian ship at Salamis, the Crotoniates being the only over-seas Greeks to aid against the Medes. This fixes the date of his Pythian victories near the beginning of the fifth century B. C. Plutarch¹⁵ and Pausanias¹⁶ speak of his help at Salamis, and the latter adds that Phaÿllus did not win at Olympia, but only at Delphi, once as runner and twice as pentathlete. Aristophanes¹⁷ twice alludes to a runner of this name, of unknown provenience and date. While the scholiast on the former passage and Suidas¹⁸ both identify him with the

¹¹ "Phaÿllus and his Record Jump," *J. H. S.*, XXIV, 1904, pp. 70-80, and "Further Notes on the Greek Jump," *ibid.*, pp. 179-194.

¹² *Anthol. gr. App.*, III, 28 (III, p. 292 [Dübner] Cougny); also in Th. Preger's *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae ex scriptoribus praeter anthologiam collectae*, Lipsiae, 1891, No. 142.

¹³ Zenobius, VI, 23, p. 384; T. Gaisford, *Paroemiographi Graeci*, Oxonii, 1836 (Proverbia Zenobii, pp. 228 f.).

¹⁴ VIII, 47.

¹⁵ *Alexander*, 34.

¹⁶ X, 9, 2.

¹⁷ *Acharn.*, 213; *Vespes*, 1203.

¹⁸ *S. v.* Φάυλλος.

Crotonian victor, they are certainly different athletes, since Pausanias¹⁹ explicitly says that the Crotonian did not win at Olympia and Herodotus only mentions his Pythian victories.²⁰ Wernicke's attempt,²¹ therefore, to identify the two on the basis of different source material is futile.

Curiously, the epigram quoted does not appear on the recovered base which seems to have borne the statue of Phaÿllus at Delphi, though the lettering of its dedication agrees in date with whatever else we know of Phaÿllus—the first quarter of the fifth century B. C.²² His famous jump readily passed into the proverb *ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα ἄλλεσθαι* to denote any extraordinary feat. It is mentioned by several Greek writers and scholiasts from Plato on.²³ Of these, the scholiast on Lucian is best, a part of which we quote: *τῶν οὖν πρὸ αὐτοῦ [Φαῦλλου] σκαπτόντων ν' (50) πόδας καὶ τούτους πηδόντων, ὁ Φάυλλος ὑπὲρ τοὺς ν' πάνυ ἐπήδησεν κ. τ. λ.* The wording here shows that several athletes before him had jumped fifty feet, a not unusual feat, but that he alone surpassed them.

Chionis won seven victories at Olympia, four in the staderace and three in the double sprint (*δίανλος*) in Ols. 28-31 = 668-656 B. C.²⁴ Africanus alone mentions his jump of 52 feet,

¹⁹ *L. c.*

²⁰ On this Olympic victor of the same name, see Krause, *Olympia*, Wien, 1838, p. 351; Gardiner, *J. H. S.*, XXIV, pp. 78-79; Foerster, No. 794, p. 24.

²¹ *De Pausaniae studiis Herodoteis*, Berolini, 1884, pp. 77 f.

²² *Fouilles de Delphes*, III, fasc. I, No. 1, pp. 1-2, fig. 1 and Pl. I. Here 13 fragments of a circular base of Parian marble, 2.14 m. in diameter and 0.298 m. in height, have been assembled on whose vertical face are the remains of an inscription. Hauvette's restoration has been preferred by Pomtow to Homolle's:

Κροτω[ν]ιᾶται (᾿Α)[πόλλωνι Φάυ]λλον . . . [— ἀνέθηκ]αν.

See A. Hauvette, *Rev. d. ét. gr.*, XII, 1899, pp. 10-12; Th. Homolle, *B. C. H.*, XXI, 1897, p. 274; H. Pomtow, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXI, 1906, pp. 444-50 and 564.

²³ E. g., Plato, *Cratylus*, 413 A and Schol.: Lucian, *Somn. seu Gall.*, 6 and Schol.: Libanius, *ὑπὲρ τῶν ὀρχηστρ.* 373 (ed. Reiske); scholiasts on Pindar's *Nem.*, V, 19-20 (without naming Phaÿllus), and Aristophanes' *Acharn.*, 213; Suidas, *s. v.* Φάυλλος; Pollux, III, 151 (without naming Phaÿllus); etc.

²⁴ Pausanias, III, 14, 3. Dates: IV, 23, 4 and 10, and VIII, 39, 3; Africanus (*Africani S. Julii Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ*, ed. J. Rutgers, Leyden, 1862), pp. 10-11; Foerster I, 1891, Nos. 39, 41-46, pp. 4-5;

apparently made in Ol. 29 = 664 B. C.:²⁵ Ὀλ. καθ' Χίωνις Δάκων στάδιον· οὗ τὸ ἄλμα νβ' ποδῶν. Pausanias²⁶ mentions a tablet in honor of his victories set up at Olympia by the Spartan state with a statue nearby which he does not believe represents Chionis since it was fashioned by Myron of Athens. He also speaks elsewhere²⁷ of another tablet set up by the state in Sparta "close to the tombs of the Agids," similarly recording his prizes at Olympia and other places. The only other historical notice of Chionis is given by Pausanias,²⁸ who recounts that it was reported that he joined Battus of Thera on his expedition and helped him found Cyrene and subdue the neighboring Libyans.

Single jumps of 55 and 52 feet, even with the help of stone or metal weights, which—like the flute²⁹—even down to the time of Pausanias accompanied the jump to accelerate it, as both Aristotle³⁰ and Philostratus³¹ say, are manifestly impossible when we consider that the present record for the running broad jump is only about one-half of the Greek.³² Weights³³

Africanus for the first victory used the name Charmis, a difference in name due to different victor lists; see F. M. Mie, *Quaestiones agonisticae imprimis ad Olympia pertinentes*, Diss. Inaug., Rostock, 1888, Ann. 18.

²⁵ Rutgers, p. 10.

²⁶ VI, 13, 2. The statue, therefore, may have been set up in Ol. 77 or 78 = 472 or 468 B. C. See H. Brunn, *Gesch. d. gr. Kuenstler*, I, Stuttgart, 1853, p. 144.

²⁷ III, 14, 3.

²⁸ III, 14, 3. On Battus and the founding of Cyrene told by Herodotus in two versions, IV, 150-58, see How and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus*, I, Oxford, 1912, pp. 350-55.

²⁹ See Philostratus, 55; Pausanias, V, 7, 10, V, 17, 10, VI, 14, 10; Plutarch, *De musica*, 26. See flutist on an Attic r. f. pelike (dated c. 446 B. C.) in the British Museum, *B. M. Catalogue*, E 427, reproduced by Gardiner, *J. H. S.*, XXIV, p. 185, fig. 6, and *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 150, fig. 104; another on a b. f. kelebe in the British Museum, *B. M.*, 361; *J. H. S.*, XXIV, p. 180, fig. 1; etc.

³⁰ *De incessu anim.*, 3, 705a, 16; *Problem.*, V, 8, 881a, 39b.

³¹ 55; cf. for the same explanation, Theophrastus, *De lassit.*, 13, III, 134 (ed. Wimmer).

³² It is 26 ft. 5 $\frac{5}{16}$ in. (8.06 m.), made by the American negro Jesse Owens at the 11th Olympics, Berlin, 1936. He also jumped 26 ft. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. (8.13 m.) at Ann Arbor, May 15, 1935. See Spalding's *Official Almanac*, New York, 1937, p. 9.

³³ On Greek halteres, see Juethner, *Ueber antike Turngeraete*, Wien, 1896, pp. 3-13, and A. de Ridder, "Halter," in Daremberg-Saglio, pp.

are no longer used in championship meets, but were still employed in trick jumping at music-hall performances in England in the latter half of the nineteenth century. A record of 29 ft. 7 in. with five-pound weights is recorded of a running broad jump by J. Howard at Chester in 1854, the take-off from a board two feet long and three inches thick.³⁴ The Greek records then would be as fantastic as Brunhild's leap of 72 feet in the *Nibelungenlied*.³⁵ Nor could they be explained by assuming the jumper used a raised platform or springboard as earlier writers imagined.³⁶ Such devices are yet used by circus gymnasts, but are not recognized by athletic associations and there is no evidence of their use in ancient athletics. The *πέταρον*, as known from literature and monuments, was used only by acrobats, tumblers and rope-dancers.³⁷

There are, then, only two explanations of the Greek records. They are either false or they refer to a multiple jump of some sort. Gardiner was long the protagonist of the former view.³⁸ He regarded Phaëllus' record as resting only on as good evidence as that of another Crotonian athlete, the famous wrestler Milo, who among other unheard of feats "picked up a four-year heifer at Olympia, and after carrying it about killed it and ate the whole of it,"³⁹ that is, on no evidence at all. He explained the

5-7. Metal or stone ones weighed from 2¼ to 10 lbs.; for types, see Gardiner, *J.H.S.*, XXIV, pp. 181 f., *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 146, fig. 100, and *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, London, 1910, pp. 295 f.; Hyde, *Olympic Victor Monuments*, Washington, 1921, pp. 214 f.; etc.

³⁴ Myers, p. 218, n. 1. Cf. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 154; Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 216, n. 4. Whether the Greek broad jump was a running or standing one is treated *infra*.

³⁵ Strophe 463, ed. Bartsch, Leipzig, 1870; *zwoelf Klafter* (12 fathoms).

³⁶ Pinder, p. 107. On p. 106 he says a German officer in full uniform jumped with weights 23 ft. from a springboard in the Central-Turnanstalt, Berlin. Cf. Hyde, 216, n. 5 and Juethner, *Turngeraete*, p. 16.

³⁷ See Juvenal, XIV, 265. Polybius, VIII, 6, 8, speaks of it as a platform or stage. A springboard is seen on an Etruscan wall-painting from Chiusi; Inghirami, *Mus. Chius.*, Pl. CXXXI. On springboards, see Krause, *Gym. u. Agon. d. Hellenen*, p. 325.

³⁸ He held it consistently from the date of his two articles in *J.H.S.*, XXIV, and *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, 1910, p. 310, down to his last book, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, 1930, p. 153.

³⁹ Athenaeus, *Dipnosophistae*, X, 4, pp. 412 f. Pausanias, VI, 14, 6

epigram as an "alliterative jingle" (π occurs five times in line 1) like many similar late sporting epigrams in the Anthology. His solution of Chionis' record was a corruption in the text of Africanus, $\nu\beta'$ (52) for $\kappa\beta'$ (22), since the Armenian Latin text of the latter reads *duos et viginti cubitus*, where *cubitus* is equivalent to *pes*. Such a solution, however, makes the jump too short by many feet compared with jumping records with weights in our time. Nevertheless, Gardiner's argument has profoundly influenced English and American writers on athletics, including the writer, who formerly accepted his change in the text.⁴⁰ The alternative is a multiple jump. It was on this assumption that "*le triple saut*" was introduced into the pentathlon at the revived Olympics in Athens in 1896. While admitting that a triple jump was still known in North Greece, Gardiner emphatically denied it was known to the ancient Greeks.⁴¹ However, as we shall now show, he ran counter to the very evidence which he so carefully discussed.

E. Myers⁴² says that J. B. Martin, then President of the London Athletic Club, who was present at his reading of his paper on "The Pentathlon" before the Society of Hellenic Studies in 1891, later "made the bold suggestion that the Greek jump may have been the hop, step, and jump, and mentioned such a jump of 49 ft. 3 in. made without weights at Harwich as not far from the Greek record." This appears to be the earliest suggestion for a multiple jump. It was soon defended by Wassmannsdorf,⁴³ and was later worked out in detail by Fedde⁴⁴ on the basis of a passage in Bekker's *Anecdota graeca* by an unknown writer, which we here reproduce:⁴⁵

varies the story by having Milo carry his own victor statue of bronze into the Altis at Olympia. Milo won at Olympia six times, and seven at Delphi in Ols. 60-66 = 540-516 B. C. (only Ol. 62 being fixed); see Foerster, Nos. 116, 122, 126, 131, 136, 141, pp. 9-10.

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 216.

⁴¹ P. 76; and in *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 152, he says: "there is not a particle of evidence to support these guesses."

⁴² P. 218, n. 1; also in his article "Pentathlon" in Smith's *Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Antiquities*, 3rd ed., 1891, II, p. 365, n. 1.

⁴³ In *Monatsschrift*, 1885, p. 270.

⁴⁴ First in *Gym. Progr.*, Breslau, 1888, p. 13, then in his book *Der Fuenfkampf*, 1889, pp. 18 f.

⁴⁵ I, p. 224. Gardiner, p. 74, noted that the passage was part of the *Lexica Segueriana* in *Cod. Coislinianus*, 345, of the 10th or 11th century.

βατήρ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ τῶν πεντάθλων σκάμματος, ἀφ' οὗ ἄλλονται τὸ πρῶτον Σέλευκος. Σύμμαχος δὲ τὸ μέσον, ἀφ' οὗ ἀλόμενοι πάλιν ἐξέλλονται, ἄμεινον ὥς Σέλευκος. In this passage Seleucus,⁴⁶ with whom the unknown writer agrees, defines βατήρ rightly as "the top of the σκάμμα," i.e. the take-off, while Symmachus⁴⁷ wrongly believed it was the middle of the σκάμμα. But of far more importance are the latter's words ἀφ' οὗ ἀλόμενοι πάλιν ἐξέλλονται which show clearly that the leaper after alighting, jumped again, i.e. a multiple jump. Curiously, Gardiner⁴⁸ rejected this evidence completely, and for a variety of reasons: that the *halteres* would be clumsy in a series of bounds, that a second take-off would be difficult from the soft ground of the σκάμμα, and that πάλιν means "back" rather than "again." He argued that the best that could be suggested by the text was two and not three jumps.

However, Gardiner did settle the long-disputed meanings of βατήρ, σκάμμα, and τὰ ἐσκαμμένα. On the basis of several late writers⁴⁹ he showed⁵⁰ that βατήρ was merely the place from which the jumper took off, a stone sill or threshold similar to the series of such sills, incised with horizontal lines, found at either end of the stadium at Olympia, and not, as Pinder believed, a springboard. Of more importance, he showed⁵¹ that the terms σκάμμα and τὰ ἐσκαμμένα were interchangeable and referred to the soft ground, dug up, leveled, and sanded, on which the leaper alighted. Theretofore there had been only confusion in the meaning of these terms.⁵² To jump, then,

⁴⁶ Surnamed *Homericus*, Alexandrine grammarian teaching at Rome in the time of Tiberius, A. D. 14-37, and titles of his works mentioned by Suidas, s. v. See B. A. Mueller in Pauly-Wissowa, III (2te Reihe), No. 44, cols. 1251-6; and Christ-Schmid-Staehlin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, 1^o, p. 89; II^o, 1, pp. 269, 432, 444. Also Max Mueller *De Seleuco Homérico*, Diss. Inaug., Götting., 1891.

⁴⁷ See Gudeman in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. "Symmachus," no. 10, VII (2te Reihe), cols. 1136-40. He wrote commentaries on Aristophanes about A. D. 100, used by Suidas, s. v. ὑπερακοντίζειν and *passim*.

⁴⁸ Pp. 75-76.

⁴⁹ Seleucus, above; Pollux (2nd half of the second century), III, 151; Hesychius (late fourth), s. v. βατήρ and Suidas (tenth or eleventh), s. v. βατήρ.

⁵⁰ Pp. 74-5.

⁵¹ Pp. 70-74.

⁵² Cf. on basis of Schol. on Pindar's *Nem.*, V, 20 the views of F. A. Paley, *The Odes of Pindar*, London, 1868, p. 185, n. 1; J. B. Bury,

ὑπὲρ τὰ ἑκαμμένα was a most unusual feat. Suidas says that Phaÿllus jumped five feet beyond, which, with statements of other writers, shows that the σκάμμα was fifty feet long, and that in landing on the hard ground (στερεόν) beyond he broke his leg. This is understandable, as it is well known that a jumper is apt to break either his knee or ankle when landing on hard ground.

The length of the jump is often indicated on vases by pegs stuck into the ground, as on a b.f. amphora in the British Museum.⁵³ Philostratus⁵⁴ says the length of the leap was not allowed "if the imprint of the feet is not faultless," i.e. no pegs were then used. Vase-paintings show different characteristic moments in the jump. Thus a jumper is shown ready at the take-off with the *halteres* raised in his hands on a r.f. krater.⁵⁵ Another athlete is shown in midair, his legs and arms nearly parallel and the *halteres* held straight out, on a r.f. kylix in Boston.⁵⁶ He is shown just before alighting on the b.f. amphora in the British Museum (B 48) already discussed.

Gardiner's conclusion that "the only evidence" for a series of jumps is the passage in the *Anecdota graeca*, which he unfortunately rejected, is no longer valid, for now it is supplemented by the new evidence adduced by Professor Juethner.⁵⁷

Nemean Odes of Pindar, London, 1890, p. 91; P. Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 213; E. Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 218, n. 1 (corrected in Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.*, p. 364).

⁵³ *B. M. Cat. Vases*, B. 48; *Jb. des arch. Inst.*, V, 1890, p. 243; Gardiner, p. 183, fig. 4, and *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 150, fig. 106; Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "Saltus," fig. 6084 and s.v. "Halter," p. 6, fig. 3692. It dates from the second quarter of the sixth century B. C.

⁵⁴ 55.

⁵⁵ *Annali (Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica)*, Roma, XVIII, 1846, Tav. d'agg. M: *J. H. S.*, XXIV, p. 185, fig. 7; Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "Saltus," p. 1055, fig. 6082 (1st figure to left).

⁵⁶ *Arch. Ztg.*, XLII, 1884, Taf. XVI 2b; W. Klein, *Euphronios*, 2nd ed., Wien, 1886, p. 286; Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "Halter," p. 5, fig. 3691; Gardiner, p. 183, fig. 3, and *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 150, fig. 105; J. D. Beazley, *Attic R. F. Vases in American Museums*, Cambridge, 1918, p. 83, fig. 51.

⁵⁷ "Zur Geschichte der griechischen Wettkaempfe," *Wiener Studien*, 53, 1936, pp. 76-8.

He cites a passage from the paraphrase of Aristotle's *Physica* by Themistius, the Paphlagonian philosopher and rhetorician who lived in great honor at Constantinople in the latter half of the fourth century under the emperors from Constantius to Theodosius the Great.⁵⁸ This short passage has so important a bearing on the pentathlon jump, as an indubitable proof that it consisted of some sort of multiple one, that we translate it:

"The thing is said to change continuously which leaves no interval either of time or of the thing in which it moves; for example, anyone singing might sound the lowest string⁵⁹ immediately after the highest; for such a person has left no interval of time or of the thing in which he moves. But this is more obvious in respect of place changes; for the leapers in the pentathlon do not move continuously, since they leave out some part of the space in which they move; or is this not to be stated absolutely? For in this case we would say that race-horses do not move continuously. But we must rather define continuous movement in respect of time and the fact that no interval of it (i. e. time) is left out, since it is possible, perhaps, also to leave out a part of the thing in which it moves, and none the less continuously it seems to change, while continuity *per se* must be defined more precisely."

Here Themistius interprets Aristotle's idea of continuous movement as one in which the entire time interval is filled up with the event concerned, and exemplifies it with place changes. He cites as an example of the non-fulfillment of the assigned condition the pentathlete jumpers who "do not move continuously, since they leave out some part of the space in which they move" (i. e. the *σκάμμα*). To quote Juethner: "A leaper from the moment when he jumps from the take-off to the time when he touches the ground again without doubt executes a continuous movement without any interruption in the space covered." But Themistius says in the case of leapers that there

⁵⁸ His dates are c. A. D. 317-388. He became tutor to Arcadius, son of Theodosius, 387-88. He paraphrased the *Physica* in 8 books c. 355. See Christ-Schmid-Staehlin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, II^o, 2, pp. 1004-14. See *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca* (Themistii in *Physica* paraphrasis), ed. H. Schenkl, Berolini, 1900, V, 2, p. 172, lines 26 f. The text of Aristotle is 5, 3, 226b, 31 f. (Prantl, Teubner, 1879).

⁵⁹ I. e., of the harp or lyre, our *highest* pitch.

are interruptions in the movement inside the jumping-space. This passage, hitherto unnoticed, is therefore important in explaining the Greek jump as not one continuous single effort, but as an interrupted effort, i. e. several individual springs. The same conclusion is drawn from Themistius' argument about race-horses that they "do not move continuously," the similarity between leapers and race-horses consisting in this, that as the former reach their goal by multiple efforts, so also do the latter by countless individual jumps. This passage from Aristotle, then, supplementing the earlier evidence discussed, makes it clear that the pentathlon jump was a multiple one. The long line of writers⁶⁰ from Wassmannsdorf to Juethner were, therefore, right in assuming this, while Gardiner was woefully wrong in contending that it was a single effort.

The only question left to be discussed is what sort of a multiple jump is indicated. Only two seem to enter into it, the Anglo-American hop, step and jump, and the modern Greek hop, hop, and jump. At the revival of the Olympics in 1896 the "*triple saut*" was literally a hop, hop and jump, but in practice became a "*saut, pes, saut*," our hop, step and jump, which has been used exclusively since. My former colleague, Professor Émile Malakis, now of Johns Hopkins University, tells me that in his youth Greek boys only knew the hop, hop and jump, and that the change under the influence of the Olympics to hop, step and jump was gradual. The technique of the two is different: in the latter the jumper lands on the foot from which he made the spring, then takes a giant stride or step and lands on the other foot, and finally on both, while in the hop, hop, and jump, he makes two hops on the same foot and then lands on both.

Let us translate the jump of 55 and 52 feet of Phaëllus and Chionis respectively into meters and English feet and compare them with present records in the "*triple saut*." Using the Solonian-Attic foot, introduced at the beginning of the sixth century B. C. but not used in Athens until Roman days, of 0.296 m. (= 1 Roman foot),⁶¹ Phaëllus' jump at Delphi would

⁶⁰ It includes Fedde; Ph. Legrand, *op. cit.*, p. 1056, n. 2; F. Hueppe, *Die Leibesuebungen*, 1925, p. 166; Faber, *op. cit.*, p. 478; and others.

⁶¹ More exactly 0.2957 m. See W. Doerpfeld, "Beitraege zur antiken Metrologie, I, Das Solonisch-attische System," *Ath. Mitt.*, VII, 1882, pp. 277-312.

be 16.28 m. or c. 53 ft. $4\frac{2}{5}$ in. The foot used in connection with Chionis' jump at Olympia, on the other hand, was the earlier Aeginetan-Attic (Phidonian) one equal to 0.328 m. Doerpfeld calls this foot "der gemeingriechische Fuss" appearing in all Attic inscriptions and writers from Herodotus to Eratosthenes, and in the great fifth-century buildings on the Acropolis, including the Parthenon.⁶² It followed the Aeginetan coinage throughout the Peloponnesus and was especially used at Olympia whose architects preferred it to that of the stadium foot (0.320 m.) there, which latter Doerpfeld calls "das heilige Mass,"⁶³ rarely used. The stadium at Olympia was longer than other Greek stadia, explained as being measured by Heracles' feet, which were larger than those of mortals.⁶⁴ Thus Chionis jumped 16.66 m. or 54 ft. 8 in., so that the two records are not so far apart as they seem. We can now compare these figures with modern records in triple jumps.

An English athlete made a record in the hop, step, and jump of 15.01 m. or 49 ft. 3 in. at Harwich in 1861,⁶⁵ from which date the record has gradually increased, till the present Olympic and world record of 16 m. or 52 ft. $5\frac{7}{8}$ in. was made by Naoto Tajima of Japan at the Berlin Olympics, Aug. 6, 1936.⁶⁶ These records are close to the Greek ones of Phayllus and Chionis, the use of jumping-weights and the possible omission of the "pace" before the leap well explaining the difference.

Fedde already in 1888⁶⁷ proposed the hop, hop, and jump as a possible solution of the Greek jump. This contest is no longer used in serious athletic contests, though it still appears in minor meets in Greece and elsewhere. A record of 49 ft. $\frac{1}{2}$ in. without weights was made some years ago by J. B. Conolly.⁶⁸

⁶² "Metrologische Beitræge, V, Das aeginaeisch-attische Mass-System," *Ath. Mitt.* XV, 1890, pp. 167-187, especially p. 175. The name Phidonian comes from Aristotle, *Const. Athens*, 10.

⁶³ In *Olympia, Die Ergebnisse*, II (Baudenkmaeler), Berlin, 1892, 19.

⁶⁴ A. Gellius, *Noct. Attic.*, I, 1 (quoting Plutarch, *Reliq. ex vitis*, VII, p. 144 [Teubner ed. by Bernardakis]). Cf. also J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, IV, London, 1898, pp. 78-81 (to VI, 20, 8). The Olympic stadium was 192.27 m. long, which makes its foot 0.32045; see Doerpfeld, *l. c.* and R. Borrmann, *Ergebnisse*, II, pp. 63 f. (Das Stadion).

⁶⁵ Noted by Myers in *J. H. S.*, II, 1881, p. 218, n. 1; Hyde, p. 216, n. 6.

⁶⁶ Spalding, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 and 19.

⁶⁷ *Gymn. Progr.* Breslau, pp. 22-4 and 35, n. 5.

⁶⁸ Mentioned in the *Britannica* (11th ed., 1911), XV, p. 554, place and

As far back as 1891 a record of 50 ft. 1½ in. was made by D. S. Shanahan in England, when the hop, hop, and jump was still practiced generally.⁶⁹ The present record is c. 53 feet.⁷⁰ In fact, the record for this jump should be better than that for the more usual hop, step, and jump and for two reasons: the swing of the unused leg and the fact that only one leg is used. Since it was used altogether in Greece until recent years it is probable that the hop, hop, and jump is a lineal descendant of the ancient pentathlon.

Gardiner has argued from various vase-paintings⁷¹ that the Greek pentathlete preceded his jump by only a few short bounds before the take-off in contra-distinction to the modern running long jumper who depends chiefly on a short fast run on a cinder path. This latter he regarded as inconsistent with the use of jumping-weights. Consequently, the pentathlete was no sprinter, but merely limbered his legs with a few springy steps in preparation for the final leap, somewhat as our high jumpers do. However, it seems incredible to the writer that the Greek jumper should not have employed the preparatory "pace," even if encumbered with weights which weighed 2½ pounds or more. But this as yet cannot be determined definitively.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

date omitted; no record is given in the article "Jumping" in the 14th ed., 1929.

⁶⁹ See M. W. Ford, in *Outing*, XX, 1892, pp. 235 f.

⁷⁰ So Lawson Robertson, Professor of Physical Education at the University of Pennsylvania, in a letter to me on April 27, 1937.

⁷¹ *J. H. S.*, XXIV, pp. 187-90. He here reproduces on p. 191, fig. 11, a r. f. kylix from E. Gerhard, *Auserlesene gr. Vasenbilder*, IV, Berlin, 1858, Taf. 294, 7; and on p. 188, fig. 9, another r. f. kylix from W. Klein, *Euphronios*, p. 306. We add another r. f. Wuerzburg archaic amphora, Gerhard, Taf. 270 (bottom). In the latter stand a discus-thrower, flutist, and a running jumper—though Gerhard explained the third figure as a discouraged jumper; same also in Daremberg-Saglio, "Halter," p. 7, fig. 3694.

CENSUS AND POLL-TAX IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT.

When Wilcken published his great work on the Greek ostraca in 1899 he was convinced, because of lack of evidence for the poll-tax in Egypt during the Ptolemaic period, that Augustus had introduced that tax as a part of his changes in the financial administration when he took over Egypt as his special province.¹ Since the publication of the *Tebtunis Papyri* and of the third volume of the *Petrie Papyri*, however, most historians have believed that the poll-tax was collected under the Ptolemies.² Nevertheless the complete lack of receipts for this tax before the reign of Augustus has been most disturbing.³ Wilcken, following Grenfell and Hunt, also maintained that the fourteen years census-period, found in Egypt from 10 B. C. until the second half of the third century of our era, was introduced by Augustus, despite Borchardt's attempt to prove the existence of a fourteen years census-period under the Pharaohs of the Middle Kingdom.⁴

¹ *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien*, I, pp. 245 ff.

² Maspero, *Les Finances de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, 1905, pp. 93 f.; Rostovtzeff, in *Cambridge Ancient History*, VII, p. 139; Jouguet, *Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East*, 1928, p. 309; Cary, *A History of the Greek World 323-146 B. C.*, 1932, p. 264. Since this paper was written Miss Claire Préaux's discussion of the poll-tax in Egypt has come to my attention. In *Les ostraca grecs de la collection Charles-Edwin Wilbour au Musée de Brooklyn*, 1935, pp. 28-32, Miss Préaux has declared against the existence of a poll-tax under the Ptolemies. She contends that no one of the items of evidence, which are reviewed in this paper, proves the existence of the poll-tax during the Ptolemaic period. This may be granted. Nevertheless, I believe that the individual items of evidence and also their cumulative impression are best explained on the assumption that the poll-tax was introduced in the Ptolemaic period. Miss Préaux's positive argument that the poll-tax could not have been introduced by the Ptolemies because it is a mark of defeat and subjection is not impressive when applied to Egypt, a land recognized as the spear-won property of the Macedonian monarchs. Cf. K. Fr. W. Schmidt's review in *Phil. Woch.*, LVI (1936), pp. 9-13, rejecting Miss Préaux's arguments.

³ Maspero, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

⁴ Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, 1912, pp. 173 f., 192; Grenfell and Hunt in *P. Oxyrhynchus*, II, pp. 209 ff.; Borchardt in H. Schäfer, "Ein Bruchstück altägyptischer Annalen" (*Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1902), p. 9, note 1. Maspero, *op. cit.*, p. 94, states that the poll-tax existed under the Middle Empire; but he cannot mean a poll-tax like that collected by the Roman

It is the purpose of this paper to show the probability of the introduction of both poll-tax and fourteen years census-period under Ptolemy IV Philopator. The evidence does not yield absolute proof. But if the argument is accepted, several obscure and puzzling events in the reigns of Philopator and his successors find a rational explanation. In like manner some remarkable features of the tax-system in Roman Egypt become logical inheritances from the Ptolemaic system.

Strabo⁵ states that after the glorious reigns of the first three Ptolemies the rest of the kings of Egypt were corrupted by luxury and their government deteriorated. Of these later incompetents he selects three for special condemnation: Philopator, Physcon, and Auletes. Justin, in his epitome of Pompeius Trogus,⁶ contrasting Philopator with his distinguished contemporaries in Macedonia, Asia, Sparta, and Carthage, says: "solus Ptolemeus, sicut scelestus in occupando, ita et segnīs in administrando regno fuit." Polybius, to whom we owe most of our information concerning Philopator, is no more complimentary: after charging the young king with the usual list of dynastic murders he says,⁷ "He began to conduct his government with more pomp of royalty, showing himself inattentive to business and inaccessible to members of his court and the rest who were engaged in the administration of Egypt, and proving himself neglectful and indifferent to the officials in charge of affairs outside Egypt, for which the former kings had shown more concern than for the government of Egypt itself. . . . Thus extending so long an arm and protecting themselves with distant buffer-provinces they were never alarmed about their throne in Egypt. Wherefore they quite naturally showed great concern for foreign affairs. But this king neglected all of these things because of his shameful amours and his senseless and

administration in Egypt, for there was no coinage under the Pharaohs, and the only form of poll-tax which could exist without coinage was the *corvée*. The *corvée* existed from the Old Kingdom through Roman times and had nothing to do with a poll-tax collected in money. Borchardt's fourteen year period, therefore, has no bearing upon the question of a poll-tax in Ptolemaic Egypt. On the other hand, A. Calderini's attempt (in *Rend. R. Ist. Lomb.*, LXIV [1931], pp. 551-8) to establish the census of A. D. 19-20 as the first of the fourteen years series has been properly criticized by H. I. Bell (in *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, X, p. 304, note 2).

⁵ XVII, 1, 11 (796).

⁶ XXIX, 1.

⁷ V, 34, 3-5; 9-11.

constant drunkenness, and naturally in a short time found his life and throne threatened by conspirators, of whom the first was Cleomenes the Spartan."

The Jews, as we know from *III Maccabees*, looked back upon the reign of Philopator as one of oppression and injustice, and they took their peculiar revenge by blackening his memory.

The revolts of the Egyptians which began in his reign and were not finally suppressed until some years after his successor came to the throne are an adequate testimonial to the feeling of his native subjects towards Philopator.

Mahaffy⁸ suggested that, "It is not impossible that some of the bad impressions produced upon posterity were due to the anecdotic sketches of the life of Philopator by Ptolemy the Megalopolitan." If, indeed, this Ptolemy the Megalopolitan was the same Ptolemy who was governor of Cyprus under Philopator and his successor, he may well have felt that the king was neglecting foreign affairs: the colonial administrator seldom realizes that a crisis at home can take precedence over an urgent problem on a distant colonial frontier.

Mahaffy alone among historians has attempted a serious defense of the character of the fourth Ptolemy, and his arguments are rejected *in toto* by Bevan.⁹ It is not my purpose to rehabilitate the character of Philopator, to excuse the political murders with which he began his reign, or to condone his notorious private life. I shall, however, attempt to account for the neglect of foreign affairs with which he is charged, for the unrest of the native Egyptians which led to long and bitter revolt, and for the undoubted hatred of his Jewish subjects and the consequent loss of the province of Coele-Syria.

When Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his astute finance minister Apollonius took from the priests and temples of Egypt the *ἀπόμοιρα*, the sixth part of the produce of the vineyards and orchards of Egypt, and transferred that revenue to the official cult of Arsinoë Philadelphus, it was a profitable move.¹⁰ The

⁸ *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, 1895, p. 272, note 1.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 279 ff.; *A History of Egypt—IV*, Mahaffy, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1899, pp. 142 f. The same, Bevan, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927, pp. 250 f.

¹⁰ Grenfell and Mahaffy, *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 1896, Col. 36. Cf. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides*, 1906, III, pp. 195 ff.

priests were compensated for this lost revenue by subsidies from the royal treasury.¹¹ But as the Graeco-Macedonian colonists in the Fayûm and elsewhere increased the acreage of their vineyards to meet the growing demand of the Hellenized portion of the populace for wine, the income from the ἀπόμωρα became larger, and the priests must have regretted their lack of foresight. This bad bargain they never forgot, and they made increasingly heavy demands upon the treasury for compensation. In the decree of the synod of the Egyptian priests recorded upon the Rosetta Stone¹² one of the highly praised benefactions of Ptolemy V Epiphanes is that he restored to them the ἀπόμωρα.

Ptolemy II Philadelphus had found no difficulty in meeting the demands of the priests. His ingenious system of taxation and royal monopolies, revealed in the famous Revenue Laws, brought in annually the enormous sum of 14,800 talents of silver and one and a half million artabae of wheat.¹³ The fabulous treasure of Philadelphus, stated by Appian¹⁴ to have been 740,000 Egyptian talents, need not concern us here. However great his accumulation of gold and silver may actually have been, it is sufficient to observe that it seems to have disappeared with the death of Philadelphus. The great expenditures of the king upon the development of the city of Alexandria, upon the Museum, the Pharos, the temples in the Delta, and the great gymnasium and library erected in Athens may have used up a large part of the treasure.¹⁵ But even more important is the well known fact that a great bureaucracy, especially when the revenues are collected by tax-farmers, cannot be maintained for

¹¹ Bouché-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, p. 201 f.

¹² *OGI.*, 90, 15. If Epiphanes actually returned the ἀπόμωρα to the priests, as this passage implies, it is possible that the priests did not retain it long.

¹³ Jerome, *Ad Dan.*, X, 5. The amount of the revenue in money seems to be confirmed by the statement of Strabo, XVII, 1, 13 (798), on the authority of Cicero, that the revenue of Ptolemy XIII Auletes was 12,500 talents of silver a year. See, however, Milne, *J. R. S.*, XVII, pp. 1 ff.; Frank, *J. R. S.*, XXIII, p. 148; my *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, Princeton and Oxford, 1938, pp. 343, 492, notes 25-6. A. H. Thompson, in his unpublished dissertation in the University of Michigan Library, has shown that the revenue in grain given by Jerome is much too low.

¹⁴ *Proem.*, 10.

¹⁵ Cf. Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, pp. 127 ff.

long at a high point of efficiency. It is possible that a decline in the collections of revenue in his extensive empire may have begun before the end of Philadelphus's long reign, after the king had given up cares of state to devote himself to the enjoyment of all the luxury that his treasure could buy. The removal from office and the disgrace of Apollonius, the great finance-minister of his father, by Ptolemy III Euergetes immediately after his accession to the throne¹⁶ was probably not without due cause. If so, the entire bureaucracy may have been corrupted.

If there was a decline in the royal revenue it did not worry Philadelphus's energetic successor, Euergetes I. Early in his reign Euergetes waged a successful campaign against the disorganized Seleucid empire. The campaign was more of a royal progress than a war, for no army could be found to stand against the king of Egypt. But at the height of his success, after he had received the submission of Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Susiana, Persia, Media, and far-away Bactriana,¹⁷ he was forced to return to Egypt by what Justin¹⁸ termed a *domestica seditio*. Mahaffy was probably correct in connecting this disturbance with the failure of the Nile and the consequent grain shortage recorded in the decree of Canopus.¹⁹ When Euergetes returned to Egypt he was not at all dismayed by the serious condition brought about by the famine. He had brought with him as the spoils of war 40,000 talents of silver,²⁰ almost the equivalent of three years' revenue from the whole Egyptian empire. Euergetes spent his easily acquired wealth with a lavish hand. The decree of Canopus states that the king purchased at his own expense grain from other countries which was distributed to the populace; furthermore he lightened and remitted taxes both to the people and to the priests. It is not hard for a generous king, who is well supplied with money, to remit taxes. It is more difficult to resume their collection.

After his great "conquest" of the Seleucid empire Euergetes

¹⁶ Cf. Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt*, 1922, pp. 20, 170 f.

¹⁷ *OGI.*, 54, 14-20, with due allowance for exaggeration in a laudatory inscription.

¹⁸ XXVII, 1, 9.

¹⁹ *OGI.*, 56 and Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 204. But cf. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 1877-8, II, p. 403; Dittenberger, *OGI.*, 56, *adn.*

²⁰ Jerome, *Ad Dan.*, XI, 8.

settled down to enjoy the fruits of victory. Although he could not possibly hold all of the territory which had submitted to him, nevertheless his empire remained larger than that of his father Philadelphus.²¹ Governors had been left behind to consolidate his conquests,²² and the additional revenue from the new provinces was most welcome to a king who was about to emulate the luxurious tastes of his predecessor. Euergetes carried on the support of the great Museum at Alexandria. Eratosthenes was brought from Athens to succeed Callimachus as Chief Librarian and to be the tutor of the Crown Prince.²³ Many other famous scholars were engaged, with the result that at no time was the Museum more flourishing and famous. Great accessions were made to the Library.²⁴ Euergetes got possession of the original manuscripts of the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides at a cost of fifteen talents.²⁵ Attalus I of Pergamum was perhaps already beginning the collections for the library developed by his successor Eumenes II, and this rivalry may have raised the prices of rare books.

The insatiable greed of the Egyptian priesthood made successful demands upon the treasury of Euergetes. Mahaffy²⁶ felt an implied threat in the phrase of the decree of Canopus, 'in requital for which (succor in time of famine and remission of taxes) the gods have granted that their royalty be well established,' which is, he says, "perhaps an indication that the reverse case was a threatening possibility." Now there was never any love lost between the grasping Egyptian priesthood and the poverty-stricken Egyptian people, but it appears as if at the time of the *domestica seditio* they had stood together in their demands for relief from famine and taxation.²⁷ Every reader of Plato's *Republic* knows that the best way to cope with two allied foes is

²¹ Cf. *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, VII, p. 719.

²² Jerome, *loc. cit.*; *CIG.*, 2905, 5 (C), 4.

²³ Suidas, *sub* 'Επαροσθένης; Wilamowitz, *Nachr. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss.*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1894, pp. 30 f.

²⁴ Tzetzes (*Proleg.* to Aristophanes, *Plutus*) ascribes to Callimachus the statement that at the time of Euergetes I the library contained 400,000 'mixed' and 90,000 'unmixed' rolls. It had numbered 200,000 rolls in 285 B. C., according to Demetrius of Phaleron (*Pseudo-Aristeas apud Euseb., Praep. Ev.*, viii², p. 350a).

²⁵ Galen, XVII, i, p. 603.

²⁶ *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1899, p. 113, note 2.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

to come to terms with one of them and with his aid to crush the other; the possessions of the vanquished can then be turned over to the new ally as his reward. Euergetes came to terms with the priests. The imposing lists of his benefactions to priests and temples bears eloquent witness to the growing power of the Egyptian clergy: the beginning of the decree of Canopus²⁸ declares, "King Ptolemy . . . and Berenice, his sister and wife, Benefactor Gods, are continually performing many great benefits to the national temples, and increasing the honors of the gods, and in every respect take good care of Apis and Mnevis and the other renowned sacred animals with great expense and good appointments; and the sacred images carried off from the land by the Persians, the king, having made a foreign campaign, recovered into Egypt and restored to the temples from which each of them had been carried away." The cost of the great temples built by Euergetes must have been very considerable, because even forced labor upon any building operations outside the dike- and canal-system had to be remunerated. There are few remains of buildings of Ptolemy Soter or of Philadelphus. But remains of Euergetes's temple-construction are to be found in most of the great sanctuaries of Egypt.²⁹ He probably built a new temple to Osiris in Canopus; the naos of the temple of Isis on the island of Philae was completed by him, and its great northern pylon bears his inscription; on the neighboring island of Biggeh there are temple ruins on which the name of Ptolemy III is found. At Assuan the façade of a small temple bore his figure and inscriptions; a temple was erected by him at Esneh. But the most imposing monument which remains from the whole Ptolemaic period is his vast temple of Horus at Apollonopolis Magna (Edfu), a temple so great that it could not be completed during his reign. Temples on the grand scale cost proportionately.

Not only at home did the king expend his great revenues. Euergetes's foreign policy following his Syrian expedition was suited to his easy-going temperament, but it was expensive. Content with long years of peace he declined to take active part in the struggles in Greece and Asia, but he gave aid from his treasury to whatever faction seemed likely to further his imperial

²⁸ *OGI.*, 56—Mahaffy's translation.

²⁹ Cf. Bevan, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927, pp. 214 ff.

policy. He probably gave financial as well as moral support to Alexander son of Craterus and to Hierax and Attalus.³⁰ For years he subsidized Aratus and the Achaean League against the power of Macedon, and when Aratus failed he transferred his support to Cleomenes. This diplomacy of the purse was a heavy drain upon the royal treasury, and Euergetes suddenly stopped the payments. As soon as the sinews of war were thus withdrawn Cleomenes was crushed and fled for safety to the court of Euergetes.³¹ This would have been an amazing thing for Cleomenes to do, if the Egyptian king had just betrayed him by deliberately cutting off support in the time of greatest need. The simplest explanation is that Ptolemy may have found his treasury unequal to continuing the subsidies.

There is another incident most easily explained by the assumption that Euergetes found himself financially embarrassed. With his characteristic generosity Euergetes led the way in contributing princely gifts to the Rhodians when their city was almost completely destroyed by a disastrous earthquake and their commercial credit was endangered. Polybius³² relates that, "Ptolemy also promised them three hundred talents of silver, a million artabae of corn, timber for the construction of ten quinqueremes and ten triremes, forty thousand cubits (full measure) of squared deal planking, a thousand talents of coined bronze, three thousand talents for the restoration of the Colossus, a hundred master builders and three hundred and fifty masons, and fourteen talents per annum for their pay, and besides all this, twelve thousand artabae of corn for the games and sacrifices and twenty thousand artabae to feed the crews of ten triremes. Most of these things and the third part of the money he gave them at once." We may note that Euergetes did not immediately pay two-thirds of the money, and apparently he had not paid it by the end of his reign, for the incident is related by Polybius in his account of Philopator's reign. Two hundred talents of silver ought to have been but a trifling sum for a king whose empire should have yielded at least 14,800 talents a year, which had been the annual revenue under Philadelphus when the empire was not so extensive as under Euergetes. Perhaps the

³⁰ Cf. *Cam. Anc. Hist.*, VII, pp. 221, 726.

³¹ Polybius, II, 69, 10-11.

³² *Idem*, V, 89.

reason for the delay in forwarding the remaining two-thirds of his gift was that Euergetes did not have it to spare, because he was no longer collecting so large a revenue from his empire.

Ptolemy III Euergetes died of disease, as Polybius³³ expressly tells us. There is no evidence that Ptolemy IV Philopator had been associated with his father on the throne of Egypt before the latter's death.³⁴ We know, however, that Philopator was intended by his father to be the heir, and that he was carefully educated with that in view.³⁵ If Philopator had been formally associated with his father in the government, he might have been able to effect a gradual readjustment of the financial administration. But when in 221 B. C. he ascended the throne the situation in Egypt was desperate. The attack of the fiery young king Antiochus III upon the Lebanon forts, the gateway to the Ptolemaic possessions in Coele-Syria, although abortive, was a sure indication of further danger threatening Egypt.³⁶ By the time of Philopator's accession the once powerful Egyptian army had been allowed to fall into decay.³⁷ The same carelessness of Euergetes had probably permitted the financial administration to slip into inefficiency. It was the first task of Philopator and his able minister Sosibius to reorganize the financial system of Egypt. It is no wonder that the provincial governors complained of the king's neglect of foreign relations; affairs in Egypt demanded undivided attention. Cleomenes, who had been given asylum in Alexandria by Euergetes after the defeat at Sellasia, continually demanded supplies and troops, for the time was ripe for the overthrow of Macedonian supremacy in Greece; but Philopator could not grant his request because he had neither the troops nor the money (Polybius, of course,

³³ *Idem*, II, 71, 3.

³⁴ Blum, in *Bull. Cor. Hell.*, XXXIX (1915), pp. 18 f.

³⁵ See note 23 above.

³⁶ Polybius, V, 45, 7—46, 5.

³⁷ *Idem*, V, 62, 7. Bevan (in *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927, p. 225, note 2) contends that Euergetes would not have let the army fall into decay, but that the unpreparedness was due to the lack of discipline which developed in the army because of the neglect by Philopator. But if that were the case, there would have been no necessity of building up the army with mercenaries and with the inclusion of 20,000 native Egyptians; it would have sufficed to restore discipline, for the army could not have melted away in so short a time.

attributes this to Philopator's lack of interest in foreign affairs).³⁸ He was likewise unable to give support to Achaëus in Asia Minor, although the latter's revolt promised to hold off the threatened attack of Antiochus III against the Syrian provinces of Egypt. Yet the financial reorganization was put through so quickly by Philopator and Sosibius that they obtained funds sufficient for the emergency that Egypt faced. After the failure of his attack on the forts at Lebanon Antiochus III was called away to put down revolts in the eastern part of his disintegrated empire. This gave Sosibius a short respite in which to prepare for the defense of Egypt; by coolly bluffing Antiochus out of an immediate attack in force upon Pelusium he extended the time to two years.³⁹

Sosibius spared no expense in preparing the new army.⁴⁰ Seventy-three elephants were brought from the interior of Africa and trained for battle. The most brilliant military experts of Greece were hired to train and lead twenty thousand Egyptians and twenty-five thousand Graeco-Macedonian troops, including thousands of mercenaries. The Egyptians had to be armed in the Greek manner, a matter of no little expense, and the whole army was kept under arms and thoroughly drilled for a year. Since the army remained in Egypt during this period, it could not live off the country; the entire expense of its support fell upon the treasury. But the result of the battle of Raphia was ample reward for the great outlay. Egypt was saved for two generations from danger of invasion by the Seleucids.

The victory of Raphia was, however, a thing far different from the parade which Ptolemy III Euergetes had made through Syria and Mesopotamia. Raphia was a hard fought battle, and Philopator was almost as anxious as Antiochus to make peace. There was no vast booty, the equivalent of three years' revenue, to bring back to Alexandria. Yet Philopator seems not to have lacked adequate revenue for years thereafter. He must have been able to pay the remaining two hundred talents of silver to the Rhodians, else Polybius would hardly have related Euergetes' promise in the account of Philopator's reign without seizing the opportunity to remark upon the failure of the unworthy son to keep the promise so generously made by his father. Philopator

³⁸ Polybius, V, 35, 2-6.

³⁹ *Idem*, V, 62, 4.

⁴⁰ *Idem*, V, 63, 8 to 65.

also kept up the standards of the Museum and Library at Alexandria, and even built a temple to Homer.⁴¹ He had money to squander upon two ships of gigantic size, one a sea-going vessel whose banks of oars numbered forty and whose length was one hundred and twenty-nine metres, the other a floating villa for the use of the court in excursions up the Nile, with saloons and bed-chambers and colonnades, all carried out in precious woods and ivory and gilt bronze, and decorated by Greek artists with carpets and embroideries.⁴² Perhaps the warship was not very useful nor the pleasure-boat in good taste, but they were certainly expensive. Philopator was also able to meet the demands of the priests for subsidies,⁴³ and his building program rivalled that of his father.⁴⁴ The continued support of the priesthood was imperative because of the series of native revolts which broke out after his return from Raphia and continued into the reign of his successor.

The outbreak of the native revolt occurred soon after the battle of Raphia, according to Polybius.⁴⁵ This historian's full account of the rebellion unfortunately is lost, but in a brief summary he characterizes it as a long guerrilla warfare devoid of notable achievements, but featured by the ferocious cruelty of the peasants with terrible reprisals by the troops sent to reduce them to submission. The cause of the revolt Polybius⁴⁶ states

⁴¹ Aelian, *Var. Hist.*, XIII, 22.

⁴² Athenaeus, V, 37-39 (203e-206c); cf. *Journ. of Hell. Stud.*, IX (1888), p. 255.

⁴³ Spiegelberg, *Demot. Inschr.*, no. 31088, pp. 14-20.

⁴⁴ Cf. the list of buildings in Bevan, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927, p. 238, and Budge, *A History of Egypt*, VII, pp. 237 ff.

⁴⁵ Polybius, V, 107. Mahaffy (*The Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 264) saw a contradiction in the *eúthéws* and *οὐ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον* of this passage and the *ὁψὲ δέ ποτε*, 'at long last,' in the excerpt from book XIV (12) which gives a summary of the revolt, and consequently he dated the outbreak of the revolt about 213 or 212 B. C. No definite conclusion as to the date can be drawn from either passage, because in V, 107 Polybius is emphasizing the alacrity with which the Egyptians took to arms after their participation in the victory at Raphia; whereas in XIV he is giving his usual condemnation of the sluggishness of Philopator in meeting an emergency.

⁴⁶ Polybius, V, 107. The prophecies quoted by Bevan, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927, pp. 241 f., to prove the existence of a spirit of nationalism among the natives of Egypt are what we might expect of any suppressed people. I do not deny the existence of such a spirit, but I do not believe

as follows: "This king (Philopator) by arming the Egyptians for the war against Antiochus took counsel that was advantageous for the present but a mistake as regards the future. For the Egyptians took great pride in the victory at Raphia and were no longer disposed to obey orders, but they sought a leader and a representative in order that they might become independent. And they attained this object not long afterward." Modern historians have generally accepted Polybius's statement of the cause of the revolt. It seems to me, however, that Polybius has mistaken the occasion of the revolt for its cause. It would be singularly naïve to suppose that the native soldiers revolted merely because they had shared in a great victory. But during the long years of the rebellion, especially in the time of Epiphanes when the prospects of its suppression seemed doubtful, there must have been many in Alexandria who lamented the day when Philopator had armed the Egyptians, for without their army training the natives could not have prolonged the revolution with such success. This may have been true, but training in arms was hardly the cause of the revolt. The cause, I believe, was the changes in the system of taxation which were introduced by Philopator and Sosibius.

Maspero observed a change in the financial administration between the reign of Euergetes I and that of Euergetes II.⁴⁷ In brief, the change was a much greater centralization of administration in the second century B. C. Maspero was unwilling to hazard a guess as to the author of the change. It is highly improbable that the change came in the reign of Epiphanes or in that of Philometor: Epiphanes was forced to remit taxes rather than to increase the efficiency of their collection, and Philometor was too distracted by the invasions of his uncle Antiochus V Epiphanes to be able to carry through any great administrative reforms. It is probable that this greater centralization was a part of the financial reorganization introduced by Philopator and Sosibius.

that the desire for a native dynasty, which after all meant little more than a change of masters, was strong enough to keep the rebellion alive for more than twenty years. If the peasants had not been suffering from economic as well as political suppression, there would have been but little desire for a change of masters.

⁴⁷ Maspero, *op. cit.*, Part II, chapters III-IV.

It is the contention of this paper that in the year 220-19 B. C. Philopator introduced the fourteen years census-period and the poll-tax called *σύνταξις*, which was paid monthly. I believe that the accounts of this poll-tax were kept in ledgers similar to the *συντάξιμον* ledgers dating from the Roman period and found in the Fayûm.⁴⁸ No receipts were issued by the collectors of this *σύνταξις*, just as after the beginning of the reign of Philopator no receipts were issued for any capitation taxes.⁴⁹ The pig-tax (*ὑκίη*) and dike-tax (*χωματικόν* and *ὑπὲρ διαχωμάτων*) disappear from the receipts at this time because they were transformed into capitation taxes.⁵⁰ These capitation taxes appear again in the receipts of the Roman period.

Receipts for capitation taxes were no longer given after the financial reforms of Philopator, because their omission cut down the expense of tax-collection. Not only was the cost of papyrus

⁴⁸ For the *συντάξιμον* ledgers of the Roman period cf. Preisigke, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, IV, pp. 95-114; *P. Columbia*, I, recto 2. For Ptolemaic ledgers of similar character, but which antedate the introduction of the *σύνταξις*, cf. *P. Petrie*, III, 109.

⁴⁹ This may be checked by running through the list of taxes compiled in Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*, Bd. III, Abschn. 11. It can hardly be an accident that no receipts for capitation taxes have been discovered from the period beginning with the reign of Philopator, since receipts for other taxes from the later Ptolemaic period are not uncommon. The only possible exceptions are (1) a receipt for *σύνταξις* in *O. Meyer*, 9, where the formula *ἀπὸ τῆς συντά (ξεως)* makes it unlikely that this is a receipt for the poll-tax, but as Meyer suggests (*adn. ad loc.*) it may well be a receipt for the *σύνταξις τῶν πορθυλίων*, which was not a capitation tax; (2) the doubtful expansion *ἐπικ (εφάλαιον)* in *O. Bodl.*, 122, dated 84(?) B. C., but the expansion *Ἐπικ (ράτης)*, a signature, is probably correct. That the later Ptolemies collected no capitation taxes is incredible, and there is a reference to *φυλακτικόν* (which was a capitation tax in the Roman period) in *P. Tebtunis*, I, 5, 15, dated 118 B. C. The receipts for *ἀλικά* in *O. Strassburg*, 37 and 176 seem to be amounts too large for an ordinary capitation tax on salt.

⁵⁰ The pig-tax and dike-tax were property taxes in the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus; cf. *PSI.*, IV, 379; 381; 384, 2; *P. Hibeh*, 112, 13, note. During the first two centuries of our era the dike-tax was assessed throughout Egypt at a uniform rate of 6 drachmae 4 obols a year (for exceptional increases in the assessment of this tax cf. *P. Princeton*, I, 11 and *Theban Ostraca*, p. 129). The pig-tax in Lower Egypt was not a license-fee in Roman times, but it was a capitation tax (cf. the analysis of the pig-tax in my *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, chapter IX).

saved throughout the nomes of Lower Egypt,⁵¹ but in the bureaux in all the territory of Egypt the clerks who had made out these receipts could be eliminated or put to better service. If, as I have tried to show above, the financial situation of Egypt was precarious at the beginning of the reign of Philopator, this step towards economizing would have been quite in order; but it is not at all likely that it was popular with the employees of the bureaux whose jobs were threatened or with the populace who lost such security against dishonest tax-farmers as the possession of the receipts may have given. Nevertheless the saving was worth the trouble, for receipts for capitation taxes were not again given until Roman times.

The lack of receipts for poll-tax in the Ptolemaic period, which has troubled every proponent of such a tax, is thus explained. During the reign of the first three Ptolemies, when receipts for capitation taxes were issued by the bureaux, there was no poll-tax. After the introduction of the poll-tax by Philopator no receipts for any capitation taxes were issued.

The census was taken every fourteen years because boys became subject to payment of taxes at the age of fourteen; Philopator and Sosibius wanted the payments to begin as soon as possible. In their discussion of the census in Roman Egypt Grenfell and Hunt demonstrated that the fourteen years period can with certainty be traced back to A. D. 5-6 and probably to 10-9 B. C.⁵² The year 10-9 B. C. they held to be the earliest possible date for the introduction of the fourteen years period, because they supposed that the two reports (*ἀπογραφαί*) of the state tenant (*δημόσιος γεωργός*) Pnepheros,⁵³ dating from 19 and 18 B. C. respectively, were typical of an annual census-return before 10-9 B. C., the supposed date of Augustus's reforms. The only examples of *ἀπογραφαί* which have come down to us from the Ptolemaic period are different from the *ἀπογραφὴ κατ' οἰκίαν* of the Roman census-return. The best known of the Ptolemaic *ἀπογραφαί* is a combination of property- and census-return dating from the time of Euergetes I.⁵⁴ But the fragments of

⁵¹ Tax-receipts were ordinarily written on papyrus in Lower Egypt in Ptolemaic and Roman times; in Upper Egypt, where papyrus was hard to obtain and the price prohibitive, the receipts were written on pot-sherds.

⁵² *P. Oxy.*, II, pp. 207 ff.

⁵³ *P. Grenfell*, I, 45-46.

⁵⁴ Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, 198.

papyri published in *P. Petrie*, III, 59 (b and d) indicate that the same or practically the same conditions in regard to capitation taxes existed at the end of the third century or the beginning of the second century B. C. as we find in the Roman period: the priests are exempt from taxation,⁵⁵ and since the men are counted separate from the whole number of the household, it is evident that men only, as in the Roman period, paid capitation taxes. The character of the abstract of ἀπογραφαί in the Petrie collection is so like that of documents of similar purpose in the Roman period⁵⁶ that it may be safely concluded that shortly after the reign of Euergetes I the custom of making returns of property and persons together was dropped, and that an ἀπογραφή, similar to the ἀπογραφὴ κατ' οἰκίαν familiar in the Roman period, was introduced and was continued through the rest of the Ptolemaic period. The two ἀπογραφαί of Pnepheros, thought to prove an annual census before the year 10-9 B. C., probably have nothing to do with the census.⁵⁷ It may be remarked that a census is a costly and laborious undertaking; an annual census of the entire population of Egypt would have cost more than it was worth.

The poll-tax in Roman times was called λαογραφία, that is, 'census-tax,' for λαογραφία means 'enrollment of the people.'⁵⁸ *P. Teb.*, I, 103 and 121 from the Ptolemaic period show λαογραφία as the term for 'census,' not as the name of a tax. These two documents are dated by the editors in 94 or 61 B. C. If we begin with 10-9 B. C. and trace back fourteen year periods, we find that one falls in 94-3 B. C. It becomes quite possible that the two documents should be dated in 94 rather than 61 B. C. If we try to trace back the fourteen year periods further,

⁵⁵ The number of priests exempt from taxation was limited in Roman times; cf. Otto, *Priester und Temple*, II, pp. 245 ff.

⁵⁶ *P. Petrie*, III, 59(d). Cf. *P. Ross.-Georg.*, II, 12; *BGU.*, II, 493-510; *P. Oxy.*, VI, 984.

⁵⁷ These two returns are entirely different from any other extant ἀπογραφαι of either Ptolemaic or Roman period. They were sent in by a certain Pnepheros and are probably concerned chiefly with the report that he is a state tenant (δημόσιος γεωργός). Perhaps Wilcken (*Archiv*, II, p. 395) should not have emended the θέλων σύνταξιν of *P. Grenfell*, I, 45, 8 to <τ>έλων σύνταξιν.

⁵⁸ In the Ptolemaic period λαός designated the native Egyptians as distinguished from Macedonians, Greeks, Jews, Asiatics, etc.

we find that the combined property- and census-return dated 240 B. C.⁵⁹ indicates that the fourteen years census-period cannot be carried back beyond the latter half of the reign of Euergetes I. There is no reason to believe that Euergetes introduced the fourteen years period, since there are no indications that, after he removed Apollonius from the office of dioecetes, he made any important changes in the financial administration during any part of his reign. If, however, the fourteen year periods be carried back only to the reign of Philopator, two fall within the years of his rule (221-203 B. C.)—the first in 220-19 B. C. and the second in 206-5 B. C.

Sosibius came into power immediately after Philopator's accession. It is possible that they had planned changes in the financial system for some time, but since Philopator had not been associated upon the throne with his father even during the latter's illness, such changes had to await his own accession. It would have required at least a year to bring about so radical a change as the introduction of a census of the entire population of Egypt and the separate registration of all males over fourteen years old for the purpose of taxation. Yet there was no time to lose. Antiochus III had begun his attempt to recover Coele-Syria by his attacks on the Lebanon forts. The attacks were repulsed through the determined defense by the Ptolemaic commander, but the energy displayed by the young Seleucid king, when recalled to subdue the rebellious satrapies of his empire, boded no good for Egypt. It was only by adroit diplomacy and the most dexterous bluffing that Sosibius was able to delay Antiochus's attack on Egypt itself until the financial reforms had brought in revenue sufficient for a great Egyptian armament and until the new army had been drilled for service.

It is probable that the poll-tax was introduced with the census of 220-19 B. C.,⁶⁰ that is, the census was held for that very

⁵⁹ See note 54 above.

⁶⁰ Bickermann, in his study of the classifications of the inhabitants of Egypt in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods (in *Archiv*, VIII, pp. 234-9, especially p. 236), has found that the custom of designating the Graeco-Macedonian inhabitants by the place of their origin in Greece, Asia Minor, or elsewhere, gave way to the practice of designation by the place of their residence in Egypt. The date at which this change occurred was about 220 B. C. This change is easily explained by the assumption that the nation-wide census introduced in the year 220-19

purpose. This poll-tax was, as has often been suggested,⁶¹ called *σύνταξις*. *P. Teb.*, I, 189, dated early first century B. C., supplies the evidence from which this conclusion may be drawn. The fragment reads as follows: "Ετους κα [. . .] ι, λαογραφ(αφία) Θεογο(νίδος) τῶν τε[τηλη]κότων τὴν σύντα[ξιν κ]αὶ τὸν ἐπιστατικὸν ἐν τῷ [. . (ἔτει)], etc. There follows a list of names concluding οἱ πά(ντες) ἄνδ(ρες) Σοβ. The next column is headed ἀφ' ὧν τελ(οῦσιν) Σξγ ἀνὰ ↑ (τάλαντα) λθ' Βψ. καὶ τῶν ἀνὰ ψν, followed by the names of eight persons, thus accounting for two hundred and seventy-one. One individual, Καλὸς Κεφαλῖω(νος) αὐλ(ητής), paid only 500 drachmae. The total paid by the two hundred and seventy-two men was 40 talents 3200 drachmae. These rates for *σύνταξις* are singularly like the poll-tax of the Roman period in Lower Egypt, which was assessed at two rates; a privileged class paid at a lower rate.⁶² Furthermore one form of the poll-tax collected in the Fayûm during the Roman period was known as the *συντάξιμον*.⁶³

The usual translation of *σύνταξις* is 'contribution.' The sums paid by the allies in the second Athenian confederacy in the fourth century B. C. were called *συντάξεις* to distinguish them from the hated *φόρος* of the Delian League, which the Athenians had transformed into an hegemony.⁶⁴ Possibly the term *σύνταξις* was employed in Egypt in 220 B. C. and the years immediately following to give the impression that the tax was a 'contribution' to an emergency war-chest. In any case it is

B. C. gave to the government definite information as to the place of residence of every person in Egypt, and this information was more useful as a matter of record than a statement of the original residence of a man's father or grandfather. If the census had been introduced at an earlier or later date than 220-19 B. C., it is difficult to see why the change noted by Bickermann occurred at that particular time, rather than earlier or later. The reform of Alexandrian citizenship which was carried out by Philopator (cf. Satyrus, fragment 21 in Müller, *FHG.*, III, pp. 164 f.) may well have been connected with the introduction of the nation-wide census.

⁶¹ Wilcken, *Archiv*, II, p. 395; *Chrestomathie*, 288; Schubart, *Papyruskunde*, 1918, p. 258; Laum in *PWRE.*, 23, Sp. 732.

⁶² In the Roman period the privileged class seems usually to have paid at one half the normal rate, except in the Oxyrhynchite nome where they paid three quarters of the normal poll-tax; cf. my *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, chapter VIII.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 122-126.

⁶⁴ Francotte, *Les Finances des cités grecques*, p. 117.

not difficult to collect taxes from a nation threatened with invasion, as was Egypt in 220-19 B. C. Whether or not the Egyptian people had thought that they were 'contributing' to an emergency war-fund, Ptolemy and the wily Sosibius at the end of the war had no intention of letting such a great source of revenue be dropped. It is probable, despite the variation in the rate of assessment of the poll-tax in Roman times, that the tax introduced by Philopator was assessed at a uniform rate throughout the nation, with the exceptions made for such classes as were favored with a lower rate or with exemption, such as the *catoeci*, priests, and government officials.⁶⁵ After the victory of Raphia in 217 B. C. it was not long before the burden of the new tax became intolerable. The hard-pressed Egyptian peasant could be driven so far and no farther, especially since his recent military experience gave him new courage. This tax-burden I believe to have been the real cause of the long and bloody conflict of civil war waged between Ptolemy's soldiers and the Egyptian peasants—a *Bauernkrieg*, as Mahaffy so aptly remarked.⁶⁶

The amount of the *σύνταξις* recorded in *P. Teb.*, I, 189 is interesting. Two hundred and sixty-three men pay at the rate of 900 copper drachmae each. This is approximately equivalent to 2 or 3 silver drachmae. This sum paid annually may seem large enough for a poll-tax, but it is hardly enough to have roused an entire nation to an armed rebellion which lasted for well over twenty years. There is reason, however, to believe that 900 copper drachmae was not the rate per annum but the monthly rate. Twenty-four (or thirty-six) silver drachmae per annum added to tax-burdens already heavy is a far different matter. The reasons for supposing that 900 copper drachmae was the monthly rate is this: The Roman *συντάξιμον*⁶⁷ was not

⁶⁵ Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, II, 385, gives the population of Egypt as seven and a half millions, excluding Alexandria, *ὡς ἔνεστιν ἐκ τῆς καθ' ἐκάστην κεφαλὴν εἰσφορᾶς τεκμήρασθαι*. It would be practically impossible to deduce the number of the population from the revenue of the poll-tax in Roman times, when the various nomes of Egypt were assessed at widely differing rates. It is possible, however, that Josephus drew his figures from a period when the assessment was practically uniform throughout Egypt, i. e., in the time of Philopator.

⁶⁶ *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, pp. 264 f.

⁶⁷ Cf. notes 48 and 63 above. In *P. Petrie*, III, 86 the *σύνταξις* ('quota

a tax but a method of paying in installments the *λαογραφία* (assessed at the 40 drachmae rate) plus other small taxes and the usual supplementary charges. These were monthly payments, sometimes eleven 4 drachmae installments; hence the name *συντάξιμον*, 'like the *σύνταξις*.' It might be argued that the 900 copper drachmae at Thegonis represented a reduction in the annual rate which had been made by Ptolemy V Epiphanes;⁶⁸ but Thegonis was in the Arsinoite nome where the presence of great numbers of Graeco-Macedonian catocci made a successful native revolt impossible. In addition the irrigation projects of the Ptolemies in the Fayûm made that territory so rich that its inhabitants were able to pay a 40-drachmae poll-tax during the first two and a half centuries of Roman rule. The fact that the peasants of the Fayûm paid the highest poll-tax known in Roman Egypt makes it improbable that the abatements of taxation granted by Epiphanes extended to the Arsinoite nome. Ideally the *σύνταξις* of 900 copper drachmae per month paid by the entire male population above the age of fourteen should have yielded an annual revenue of approximately 12,000 talents of silver. Actually that enormous sum was far from being realized, because the many priests and government officials and all of the citizens of Alexandria were undoubtedly exempt from the poll-tax in Ptolemaic times; in addition great numbers of the Hellenic population outside Alexandria were wholly or partially exempt. We have seen that there were a few citizens at Thegonis who paid at a lower rate. In spite of these exemptions, the tax must have brought a most welcome addition to the revenues of the royal treasury. Ptolemy would not relinquish it without a struggle.

We do not know when the civil war broke out, but the rebellion in the Delta, which (as Mahaffy⁶⁹ pointed out) was the earlier phase of it, cannot have been very serious, for the work on the great temple of Horus at Edfu went on without interruption until the sixteenth year of Philopator's reign.⁷⁰ In

to be sold'—cf. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, 1917, p. 29, note 2) of the merchants selling oil for the state monopoly was on a monthly basis.

⁶⁸ Cf. *OGI.*, 90.

⁶⁹ *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1899, p. 141; Bevan, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927, p. 239.

⁷⁰ Cf. the hieroglyphic inscription on the wall of the temple of Horus at Edfu (quoted by Bevan, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 f.).

that year building operations ceased and were not resumed for twenty years. The rebellion had assumed serious proportions, especially since the success of the insurgents meant that the revenue of Upper Egypt could no longer be collected.

The ever ingenious Sosibius, I think, had a remedy for even that situation. He planned to extend the census and poll-tax to include the Jews. There were Jews in Egypt when the first Ptolemy came to the throne, but their numbers had been greatly increased by the favors shown them by Philadelphus, who sought them for his army,⁷¹ and by Euergetes I, who settled on the newly reclaimed land of the Fayûm Jews taken prisoner in the Syrian campaign. It is evident from *III Maccabees* that the favor of Philadelphus and of Euergetes had, in the second and third generations, resulted in a Jewish problem of serious proportions. *III Maccabees*, 2, 28 states that Ptolemy IV Philopator attempted to subject the Jews in Egypt to the census, πάντας δὲ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἰς λαογραφίαν καὶ οἰκετικὴν διάθεσιν ἀχθῆναι. Since the object of the λαογραφία was the collection of the poll-tax, we can readily understand the disturbances at Alexandria (persecutions in the eyes of the romancing writer of *III Maccabees*) and the hatred with which the Jews always regarded Philopator, for the aversion of the Jewish people to paying 'the census-tax to Caesar' is well known from the *New Testament*. The attempt to subject the Jews to the census is stated to have occurred after the battle of Raphia; consequently they had not been included in the census of 220-19 B. C., and it is probable that the attempt to enroll them occurred at the second great census in 206-5 B. C.⁷² The Jews in the Ptolemaic province of Coele-Syria were undoubtedly to be enrolled at the same time.⁷³ Within less than eight years Judaea renounced

⁷¹ Pseudo-Aristeas, *Ad Phil.*, 12-13. Cf. Bevan, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-114.

⁷² Cf. Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

⁷³ *Idem*, p. 230 (arguing against Mahaffy's view) rejects the story of Ptolemy's attempt to enter the Holy of Holies of the temple at Jerusalem as pure fiction. The only reason for attempting to date the disturbances of the Jews at Alexandria before the year 206-5 B. C. would be Philopator's supposed quick vengeance for his disappointment in Jerusalem, for which the Jews in Alexandria were in no way responsible. If the Jerusalem incident is fiction, that reason disappears.

⁷⁴ *III Maccabees*, 3, 12 states that Ptolemy IV sent the order for the enrollment of the whole race of Jews to his generals in Egypt and every place (τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον καὶ κατὰ τόπον); cf. *III Maccabees*, 4, 14:

its old loyalty to the Ptolemies and surrendered to Antiochus III.

The writer of *Ecclesiastes*, according to Barton,⁷⁵ describes the conditions in Palestine at the end of Philopator's reign:⁷⁶ "Then I returned and saw all the oppressions that are done under the sun: and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter. Wherefore I praised the dead. . . ." That the oppressions were those of taxation will become evident. The spies of Ptolemy are probably referred to in *Ecclesiastes*, X, 20: "Curse not the king, no, not in thy thought; and curse not the rich in thy bed-chamber; for a bird of the air shall carry thy voice, and that which hath wings shall tell the matter." Despite the writer's feeling expressed in these metaphors Ptolemy had not enough spies in Palestine. The negotiations of the Jews with Antiochus continued and encouraged him to carry on in spite of the early defeats of his army in Coele-Syria at the hands of the Ptolemaic general Scopas, and to complete the conquest of that province by the bloody battle of Panion, the successful siege of Sidon and the capture of Batanaea, Abila, Gadara, and Jerusalem.

Jerusalem voluntarily opened its gates to Antiochus.⁷⁷ The reason for this sudden reversal of a Jewish policy that had begun with the reign of Ptolemy I Soter is not hard to find. Josephus quotes a letter of instructions, alleged to have been sent by Antiochus to Ptolemaeus (his general in charge of the newly acquired province of Palestine), which indirectly reveals the terms upon which the Jews agreed to surrender to Antiochus. I hold no brief for the authenticity of the letter, but I believe that it represents the facts quite accurately. The significant portion reads as follows:⁷⁸ "And let the elders and the priests

ἀπογραφῆναι δὲ πᾶν τὸ φύλον ἐξ ὀνόματος. The romancing writer of *III Maccibees* states that the purpose of this enrollment was to slaughter the Jews; but it was rather to collect the poll-tax; perhaps the Jews felt that it would kill them to pay the tax.

⁷⁵ In *International Critical Commentary*, *Ecclesiastes*, pp. 58-67.

⁷⁶ *Ecclesiastes*, IV, 1.

⁷⁷ Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.*, XII, 3 (133) quoting Polybius, XVI. Yet some of the Jews remained loyal to Egypt; cf. Jerome, *Ad Dan.*, XI, 14.

⁷⁸ Josephus, *op. cit.*, XII, 3 (142-3).

and the scribes of the temple and the singers in the temple be freed from capitation taxes and from the crown-tribute and other tribute. In order, too, that the city (Jerusalem) may recover its inhabitants, I grant to those who now inhabit it and to those who move into it up to the month of Hyperberetaeus to be tax-free for three years. Thereafter I remit to them a third part of the taxes so that they may recover from the harm done them." The remission of taxes must have been the inducement that drew the Jews away from their old loyalty to Egypt. The death of Philopator in 204 or 203 B. C. and the accession of Epiphanes, while still a child,^{78a} gave Antiochus his opportunity to take advantage of the disaffection of the Jews, and by 198 B. C. Coele-Syria was forever lost to the Ptolemies.

The loss of his Syrian province was but one of the worries of the young king Epiphanes. Rebellion had broken out afresh in the Delta and continued in Upper Egypt. It was finally crushed by the king's soldiers who were able to wear down the resistance of the rebels. But the revolt was not ended without heavy concessions from the king in the matter of taxes, as we may conclude from the testimony of the Rosetta Stone and from the condition of the poll-tax in Roman Egypt during the first two centuries after Christ. The decree on the Rosetta Stone indicates also that Epiphanes had been obliged to make further concessions to the Egyptian priests in order to retain their loyalty during the doubtful times of the revolt. Naturally the congress of priests was chiefly concerned with the remission of temple-taxes, so that this occupies the most important place in the decree. Mahaffy's translation of this section of the decree follows:⁷⁹ "Being benevolently disposed towards the gods, Epiphanes, while still a child,^{78a} gave Antiochus his opportunity and corn, and has undertaken much outlay to bring Egypt into prosperity, and to establish the temples, and has been generous with all his own means, and of the revenues and taxes which he receives from Egypt some he has wholly remitted and others has lightened,⁸⁰ in order that the people (*λαός*) and all the rest

^{78a} Cf. F. W. Walbank, "The Accession of Ptolemy Epiphanes: A Problem of Chronology," in *J. E. A.*, XXII (1936), pp. 20-34.

⁷⁹ *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1899, pp. 153 ff.; Bevan, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927, pp. 264 ff.

⁸⁰ "This lightening is said to be expressed in the demotic version by

(Macedonians, Greeks, Asiatics, etc.) might be in prosperity during his reign; and has remitted the debts to the crown which they in Egypt and in the rest of his realm owed, being many in number; and those who were in prison, and under accusation for a long time back, has freed of the charges against them; and has directed that the revenues of the temples and the yearly allowances given to them, both of corn and money, likewise also the proper moiety to the gods from vine land, and from gardens, and the other property of the gods, as they were in his father's time, so shall remain; and directed also, with regard to the priests, that they should pay no more as the tax on consecration than what was appointed them in the time of his father and up to the first year (of the present reign); . . . and of the tax of byssus cloth paid by the temples to the crown has remitted two-thirds; . . . and did also free the temples of (the tax of) the artabe for every arura of sacred land, and to Apis and Mnevis did give many gifts, and to the other sacred animals in Egypt, much more than the kings before him," etc., etc.

Another clause of this decree is especially significant: " . . . and likewise has apportioned justice to all, like Hermes the great and great, and has ordained that those who come back of the warrior caste, and of the rest who went astray in their allegiance in the days of the disturbances, should, on their return, be allowed to occupy their old possessions." The victory of Ptolemy V in the civil war was evidently the result of a compromise. In the Roman period the poll-tax was assessed at different rates in the various nomes.⁸¹ This difference in rates probably dates in part, at least, from the reign of Epiphanes and may have had several causes: recognition of a difference in the economic status of the inhabitants of the several nomes and in their consequent ability to pay, rewarding of faithful subjects, and concessions to the revolting peasants. The unique

'gave them control of,' viz., gave back the collection of them to the priests."—Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 264, note 2.

⁸¹ In the Arsinoite nome the *λαογραφία* in the Roman period was assessed at 40 drachmae and at 20 drachmae per annum; in the Hermopolite nome at 16 drachmae and at 8 drachmae; in the Oxyrhynchite nome apparently at 16 drachmae and at 12 drachmae. For the rates at Elephantine-Syene and at Thebes cf. my *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, chapter VIII.

condition of the poll-tax at Thebes in Roman times perhaps goes back to the end of a similar revolt in the reign of Ptolemy X Soter II. A revolt in Upper Egypt forced this king in the year 85 B. C. to march on Thebes and to destroy the city.⁸² The inhabitants were forced to live *χωμηδόν*, and this official distribution of the inhabitants of Thebes among villages was continued in the tax-administration of Roman times, when the poll-tax and other capitation taxes were assessed at different rates in the several villages.⁸³ There is no reason why Augustus's financial agents in Egypt should have assessed the villages of Thebes at different rates, unless they were merely continuing the previous assessments, for, by the time of Augustus, Thebes had recovered sufficient physical unity to be again called Diospolis.⁸⁴ But if the poll-tax was a Ptolemaic institution, Ptolemy X may have seen in a varying incidence of taxation a means of assuring the separation of the city into villages through fostering mutual jealousy; punishment and reward may also have played a part.

Augustus took over the system of financial administration in Egypt just about as he found it. In the same way Soter and Philadelphus had taken it over from the Pharaohs.⁸⁵ Because the Assyrian and Persian conquests and the attempts of the Egyptians, before their conquest by Alexander, to restore a native dynasty had disrupted the efficient working of the system, it was necessary for Philadelphus and his minister Apollonius to formulate detailed regulations in order to put the collection of revenues on an efficient basis. Furthermore the Ptolemies' introduction of coinage into Egypt made necessary some major changes in the methods of collecting taxes. The misrule and incompetence of the later Ptolemies doubtless made further changes imperative, if Augustus was to draw the maximum advantage from his special domain in Egypt. Yet the most important changes that can be observed in the collection of money-taxes during the reign of Augustus are the resumption of giving receipts for capitation taxes and the introduction of

⁸² Pausanias, I, 9, 3. Cf. Strabo, XVII, 1, 46 (816).

⁸³ See note 81 above.

⁸⁴ Cf. O. Brüss.-Berl. 21, a receipt for a tax paid to the bank in Diospolis in A. D. 2.

⁸⁵ Maspero, *Les Finances de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, p. 172.

the συμβολικά, a charge for those receipts, by which the bureaux for the collection of taxes were made partially or perhaps even wholly self-supporting. Possibly the exemption from payment of capitation taxes possessed by men over sixty years of age was granted by Augustus.⁸⁶ Whether Augustus or the later Ptolemies abolished such taxes as the *ιατρικόν*, which disappears from among the receipts along with the other capitation taxes after the beginning of the reign of Philopator and is not found in the Roman period, is not known. What is important is that the system of capitation taxes based upon the poll-tax and fourteen years census-period, which Augustus found adequate for the financial administration of his new province, and which required but slight modification during the first two centuries of Roman rule, was the system which had been perfected by Ptolemy IV Philopator called 'one of the three worst Ptolemies' 'et segnīs in administrando regno' and by his minister Sosibius, 'a subtle instrument and full of years, yet a source of woe to the kingdom.'⁸⁷

SHERMAN LEROY WALLACE.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

⁸⁶ If Wilcken's emendation of *P. Grenfell*, I, 45 (see note 57 above) is correct, Pnephros declares that he is still paying *σύνταξις* at the age of sixty-three. If that is true, either he was being subjected to extortion or the age of immunity from poll-tax had not yet been fixed at sixty years (if that is the meaning of the phrase *τὸ τῶν ἐξήκοντα* in *BGU.*, IV, 1140, 22, dated in 4 B. C.); the age of immunity was later fixed at sixty-two years (cf. my *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, chapter VII).

⁸⁷ Polybius, XV, 25: *σκεῦος ἀγχίνου καὶ πολυχρόνιον, ἔτι δὲ κακοποιὸν ἐν βασιλείᾳ.*

APOLLONIUS OF RHODES AND THE OLD GEOGRAPHERS.

The sources of Apollonius in the *Argonautica* occupied the attention of scholars at a time when *Quellenkunde* was a favourite branch of classical learning, and the scholia offer abundant material for a critic interested in discovering the extent of the poet's erudition. It is not, however, the aim of this article to point out how Apollonius may have taken this legend from one logographer and that from another, since it can never be satisfactorily proved that the story of the *Argonautica* is a mere patchwork of extracts from earlier writers. The most recent study of the geography of the poem (by Émile Delage¹) is at pains to show the multiplicity of the geographical sources and the willingness of Apollonius to supplement Homeric geography from later authors. But criticism does not end at this point: it remains to discover on what principle the poet selected and combined this information. I propose to show how certain characteristics of Apollonius can be traced back to the Ionian logographers, in many instances to Hecataeus of Miletus in particular.² Some of these characteristics were common to other Alexandrian poets: the combination of geography with mythology, a fondness for the aetiological legend and the archaic name, and the attempt to illustrate myths by reference to geographical landmarks, temples, or curious customs which existed in the writer's own day. Ionian logography, being in the Hesiodic tradition, was doubtless familiar to many Alexandrian poets; but the peculiarly geographical nature of the *Argonautica* suggests that its author was especially dependent on Hecataeus, who was both geographer and mythographer.

Such a discussion would be difficult, if not impossible, were it not for the learned scholia. But these must not be misused: when they name some obscure poet or mythographer as Apol-

¹ *La géographie dans les Argonautiques d'Apollonios de Rhodes* (Bordeaux, 1930). Cf. also R. Walther, *De Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticorum rebus geographicis*, Diss. philologicae Halenses XII (1891), pp. 1-104 (published in part as a separate dissertation under the same title in 1890).

² That Ap. knew and used Hecataeus' works was suggested long ago by A. Weichert, *Ueber das Leben und Gedicht des Ap. v. Rhodos* (Meissen, 1821). The evidence has never been collected at length, though Delage has noted some of it.

lonius' source for a particular story, the scholiasts are merely stating an opinion which may be wrong. As earlier critics have properly insisted, it does not follow that when the scholiasts allude to an earlier writer we have definite evidence that Apollonius borrowed from him.³ Their literary knowledge does not necessarily correspond with his; they may refer to works with which he was totally unacquainted and fail to mention others with which he was familiar. Accordingly a reference on their part to Hecataeus may be regarded as relevant only when something in Apollonius' text recalls some characteristic or some statement of Hecataeus about which we have learned from another source. Apart from the seven explicit references to Hecataeus,⁴ there are numerous remarks in the scholia which are probably borrowings from him; geographical commentary is often offered in language strikingly reminiscent of the fragments preserved by Stephanus of Byzantium and others.⁵ There is, however, no possibility of proof here, and no particularly useful purpose would be served by collecting such passages.

Certain general characteristics of the *Argonautica* must be recalled before the argument can proceed. There are no traces in the story of the rationalistic treatment familiar in Herodorus of Heraclea, signs of which are found even in the fragments of Hellanicus of Lesbos. In fact the story is full of *θαύματα*, of which not the least remarkable are the geographical. To imagine that Apollonius seriously believed all the details of his fantastic geography of the fourth book is to insult his intelligence and to misunderstand the character of the poem. The *Argo*, as H. de la Ville de Mirmont has pointed out,⁶ is a Homeric ship, and the methods of handling it are in accordance with Homeric tradition; in this respect Apollonius has shown himself a careful archaeologist. When the heroes on their wanderings enter the territory traversed by Odysseus, the Homeric description of Aeaëa, the Planctae, and Scylla and Charybdis is reproduced.⁷

³ Cf. E. R. Knorr, *De Apollonii Rhodii fontibus* (Leipzig, 1902).

⁴ I, 256-59, 551a; II, 946-54c, 998-1000; IV, 257-62b, 265-66, 282-91b. These and all other references to the scholia are given according to the edition of C. Wendel (Weidmann, 1935).

⁵ This statement will be illustrated later in the article.

⁶ "Le navire *Argo* et la science nautique d'Apollonios," *Rev. Internat. de l'Enseignement*, XXX (1895), pp. 230-85.

⁷ IV, 659-81, 885-94.

If the familiar regions of Sicily are described according to ancient mythographical traditions and the limited geographical knowledge of early times, similar methods are to be expected in the description of less familiar regions. The Argonauts passed through many seas and countries which find no mention in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, and here Hesiod and the cyclic poets are occasionally helpful;⁸ but the earliest geographers after Homer, as Eratosthenes pointed out,⁹ were Anaximander and Hecataeus; Hecataeus' *Γῆς Περίοδος* or *Periegesis* is the natural place in which to look for old geographical beliefs and theories.

There is an additional reason why Apollonius might like to refer to Hecataeus. His literary rival, Callimachus, refused to accept the Alexandrian library copy of the *Asia* as genuine, ascribing it to a certain Νησιώτης. The passage of Athenaeus¹⁰ from which we learn this has given rise to frequent misinterpretation. The verdict of Callimachus was thought to throw doubt on the authenticity of the fragments and, despite the spirited and convincing defence put up by Gutschmid¹¹ and Diels,¹² the theory of a forgery was revived by Wells¹³ and after him by Grosstephan.¹⁴ At present, however, Jacoby¹⁵ and Heidel¹⁶ remain uncontradicted in their scorn for such a view. Athenaeus

⁸ Cf. F. Gisinger, "Zur Geographie bei Hesiod," *Rhein. Mus.*, 78 (1929), pp. 315-28.

⁹ Strabo, I, 1, 11: νυνὶ δὲ ὅτι μὲν "Ὅμηρος τῆς γεωγραφίας ἤρξεν, ἀρκεῖτω τὰ λεχθέντα. φανεροὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπακολουθήσαντες αὐτῷ ἄνδρες ἀξιόλογοι καὶ οἰκεῖοι φιλοσοφίας, ὧν τοὺς πρώτους μεθ' "Ὀμηρον δύο φησὶν Ἐρατοσθένης Ἀναξίμανδρόν τε, Θαλοῦ γεγονότα γινώριμον καὶ πολίτην, καὶ Ἐκαταῖον τὸν Μιλήσιον· τὸν μὲν οὖν ἐκδοῦναι πρῶτον γεωγραφικὸν πίνακα, τὸν δὲ Ἐκαταῖον καταλιπεῖν γράμμα πιστούμενον ἐκείνου εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἄλλης αὐτοῦ γραφῆς.

¹⁰ II, 70 A: Ἐκαταῖος δ' ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐν Ἀσίας Περιηγῇ, εἰ γνήσιον τοῦ συγγραφέως τὸ βιβλίον—Καλλιμάχος γὰρ Νησιώτου αὐτὸ ἀναγράφει.

¹¹ "De rerum Aegyptiacarum scriptoribus Graecis ante Alexandrum magnum," *Philologus*, X (1885), pp. 522-42, reprinted in the author's *Kleine Schriften*, I, pp. 35 ff.

¹² "Herodot und Hekataios," *Hermes*, XXII (1887), pp. 411-44.

¹³ "The genuineness of the *Γῆς Περίοδος* of Hecataeus," *Journ. of Hellenic Studies*, XXIX (1909), pp. 41-52.

¹⁴ *Beiträge zur Periege des Hekataios v. Milet* (Diss. Strasbourg, 1915).

¹⁵ *Die Fragmente der griech. Historiker* (F. Gr. Hist.), I, p. 318; *RE*, s. v. *Hekataios v. Milet*, VII, 2672-75.

¹⁶ "Hecataeus and the Egyptian priests in Herodotus Book II," *Mem. of Amer. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, XVIII, 2 (1935), pp. 53-54.

does not tell us for what reasons Callimachus denied the authenticity of the *Asia*; we do not know who *Νησιώτης* was; in consequence the remark remains both useless and unintelligible. But an explanation might be found if we knew more about the grounds on which Callimachus quarrelled with Apollonius.

In the opening lines of the poem Apollonius reveals its scope:

Ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν
μνήσομαι,

and, after a brief summary of Jason's arrival in Iolcus and the command of Pelias, he says that earlier poets have told how the Argo was built with the help of Athena:

νῦν δ' ἄν ἐγὼ γενεήν τε καὶ οὔνομα μυθησαίμην
ἡρώων, δολιχῆς τε πόρους ἄλός, ὅσσα τ' ἔρεξαν
πλαζόμενοι. Μοῦσαι δ' ὑποφῆτορες εἰεν ἀοιδῆς

(I, 20-22).

It is a curious coincidence that his choice of subject-matter exactly corresponds to that of Hecataeus, who wrote *Γενεηλογίαι* and a *Γῆς Περίοδος*, and that like Apollonius Hecataeus in his famous opening sentence uses the verb *μυθεῖσθαι*: Ἐκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω ὥς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοὶ τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὥς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσίν.¹⁷ It seems as though Apollonius were calling upon the muses to be his mouthpiece in order that he might not himself be blamed for the many *γελοῖοι λόγοι* which his poem contains; for when in the course of the poem he again invokes them, it is before recounting some episode more incredible than usual.¹⁸

To anyone unacquainted with the other touches reminiscent of Hecataeus which appear throughout the poem the parallelism between these lines and the opening sentence of the *Γενεηλογίαι* may seem merely a coincidence. But if it is a coincidence, it is the first of a long series of them. Even if it is not a reminiscence, conscious or unconscious, of Hecataeus, the statement of the poem's scope shows affinity to the fifth century logographers, who were prone to offer geographical commentary on the myths. Hecataeus is not the only logographer who tried

¹⁷ Frag. 1 (Jacoby, *F. Gr. Hist.*, I, 1).

¹⁸ II, 845; IV, 552, 1381. The invocations at the beginnings of Books III and IV are each followed by a *γάρ* clause, as though some reason had to be given for invoking them.

to put Homeric stories in their geographical setting. While many of Hecataeus' fragments show that this was a favourite characteristic of his *Periegesis*,¹⁹ there are many entries in the lexicon of Stephanus of Byzantium where it is doubtful if the sentence about the town's mythical history or the origin of its name is to be assigned to Hecataeus or to others.²⁰ To discuss and identify Homeric sites was an occupation characteristic of the school of the Ionian logographers, from whom it passed, by way of the Alexandrians, to Strabo.

Apollonius' expressed intention of combining geography with mythology is no mere conventional introduction arising from the fact that the story of the *Argonautica* is one of adventurous travel. There are a number of passages where the geographical detail is unnecessarily full, adding nothing to the story, merely revealing the poet's interest in geographical knowledge. One notices the striking detail in the description of the view which the heroes have from the top of Dindymus (I, 1112-16). Even the birthplace of Asterion, when he is named in the catalogue of heroes, is given in detail—I, 35-39; and when the heroes go to embark on the Argo:

δὴ τότ' ἴσαν μετὰ νῆα δι' ἄστεος, ἔνθα περ ἄκται
κλείονται Παγασαὶ Μαγνήτιδες (I, 237-38).

The verb κλείονται is an appeal to the reader's own knowledge of the country as it is in his own day. But the most striking purely geographical passages are in the prophecy of Phineus and the subsequent description of how the heroes follow his instructions. The prophecy is too long to quote in full; it will suffice to quote certain sections of it. Its peculiarity is that it contains many sentences which might have come straight out of a *Periegesis*.²¹

After passing the land of the Mariandyni, in which the "swift descent of Hades," the ἄκρη Ἀχερουσιάς and δινῆς Ἀχέρων call for mention (II, 353-55), he continues:

¹⁹ Cf. e. g. Frag. 169, 217, 239. ²⁰ E. g. Frag. 114, 120, 138, 255.

²¹ Cf. U. Höfer, "Pontosvölker, Ephoros und Ap. v. Rhodos," *Rhein. Mus.*, 59 (1904), pp. 542-64. He remarks that the list of Pontic tribes in Ap. gives the impression of being an extract from a *Periplus*, and attempts to prove that the author of this *Periplus* is Nymphodorus and that it was written after the time of Ephorus because certain remarks in the poet's description are reminiscent of fragments of Ephorus. On this last point see below p. 449.

ἀγχίμολον δ' ἐπὶ τῇ πολέας παρανείσθε κολωνοὺς
 Παφλαγόνων, τοῖσιν τ' Ἐνετήιος ἐμβασίλευσεν
 πρῶτα Πέλοψ, τοῦ καὶ περ ἄφ' αἵματος εὐχετόωνται.
 ἔστι δέ τις ἄκρη Ἑλίκης κατεναντίον Ἄρκτου,
 πάντοθεν ἡλίβατος, καὶ μιν καλέουσι Κάραμβιν

(II, 357-61).

The learned remark made in passing about Pelops is quite in the style of the logographers.²² But the true style of a *Periegesis* shows itself best in the description of what comes beyond the mouth of the Halys:

μετὰ τὸν δ' ἀγχίροος Ἴρις
 μειότερος λευκῇσιν ἐλίσσεται εἰς ἅλα δίναις.
 κεῖθεν δὲ προτέρωσε μέγας καὶ ὑπείροχος ἀγκῶν
 ἐξανέχει γαίης· ἐπὶ δὲ στόμα Θερμώδοντος
 κόλπῳ ἐν εὐδιόωντι Θεμισκύρειον ὑπ' ἄκρην
 μύρεται, εὐρείης διαειμένος ἡπείριοιο.
 ἔνθα δὲ Δοίαντος πεδίον σχεδόθεν δὲ πόλῃς
 τρισσαὶ Ἀμαζονίδων, μετὰ τε σμυγερώτατοι ἀνδρῶν
 τρηχέην Χάλυβες καὶ ἀτειρέα γαῖαν ἔχουσιν,
 ἐργατῖναι· τοὶ δ' ἀμφὶ σιδήρεα ἔργα μέλονται.
 ἄγχι δὲ ναιετάουσι πολύρρηγες Τιβαρρηνοὶ
 Ζηνὸς Εὐξείνιοιο Γενηταίην ὑπὲρ ἄκρην.
 τῇ δ' ἐπὶ Μοσσύνοικοι ὁμόριοι ὑλήεσαν
 ἐξείης ἡπειρον, ὑπωρείας τε νέμονται,
 δουρατέοις πύργοισιν ἐν οἰκία τεκτῆνντες
 κάλινα καὶ θαλάμους εὐπηγέας, οὓς καλέουσιν
 μόσσυνας· καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ ἐπώνυμοι ἔνθεν ἔασιν

(II, 367-83).

Except for the facility of the language, this might be a passage in the *Γῆς Περίοδος* of Pseudo-Scylax or Pseudo-Scymnus or Dionysius Periegetes.

Just as remarkable as the language in these lines and those that follow is their conformity with the geographical tradition of the names and the site of these tribes. This tradition goes back to Hecataeus, as Jacoby shows in a table of the tribes along the Black Sea as given by Hecataeus, Pseudo-Scylax,

²² Hecataeus (frag. 199—Strabo, XII, 3, 25) offered an explanation of the famous Homeric line (*Il.* II, 852):

ἐξ Ἐνετῆς, ὅθεν ἡμιόνων γένος ἀγροτεράων.

Ephorus, Xenophon, Apollonius, Dionysius Periegetes, Pliny, and Mela.²³ The correspondence of Apollonius with Hecataeus and Scylax is very close indeed. The names of these tribes—Tibareni, Mossynoeci, Macrones, Becheiri, Sapeires, Byzeres—seem to have been unknown to earlier poets.²⁴ If Apollonius was looking for an early account of the tribes on the south shore of the Euxine, Hecataeus' *Periegesis* was the place for it.

The importance of this last point cannot be stressed too strongly. The antiquarian interest which Apollonius shares with other Alexandrian poets would prevent him from being satisfied with such information as he might find in Xenophon, Ephorus, Theopompus, and other fourth-century writers who offered descriptions of this or other regions. Certainly Xenophon described the habits of the Mossynoeci and of other peoples along the coast of Pontus; Ephorus in his geographical excursus mentioned the promontory of Carambis, the Tibareni and their customs, and gave an explanation of the name of Abarnus;²⁵ Theopompus also comes in for his share of mention in the scholia; Book XXI of his *Philippica* contained a digression on Illyria and the *θαύματα* attributed to that region;²⁶ in fact he mentioned the Adriatic mouth of the Danube.²⁷ So also Ephorus and Theopompus, in common with the older logographers, retained the practice of commenting on Homeric geography.²⁸ The relevant passages in these authors may well have been familiar to Apollonius, but nothing is gained by losing sight of the fact that Ephorus and Theopompus (if not Xenophon) were using older geographical sources which were equally accessible to Apollonius; and it was these old sources, not the information of fourth century writers, which interested the poet in search of the old geographical tradition.

Apart from any indication in the scholia, the text of these

²³ *F. Gr. Hist.*, I, pp. 356-57. Höfer (*op. cit.*, pp. 559-60) seems to be content with tracing back the tradition as far as Ephorus and Pseudo-Scymnus.

²⁴ The articles in *RE* contain no allusions to an earlier author than Hecataeus; the references, apart from Apollonius, are restricted to Herodotus, Xenophon, and geographical writers.

²⁵ Frag. 41, 43, 46 (*F. Gr. Hist.*, II, 70).

²⁶ Frag. 128-31 (*F. Gr. Hist.*, II, 115).

²⁷ Frag. 129—Strabo, VII, 5, 9.

²⁸ E. g. Ephorus, frag. 128, 134, 146.

passages in Book II points very definitely to an old Periegesis and in particular to Hecataeus'. It is therefore worth while to examine the scholia to see if they confirm this impression. Though the scholia do not, it is true, actually mention Hecataeus, the comment on line 347 is a perfect example of the style of an old Periegesis: μετὰ γὰρ τὴν Φινέως νῆσον ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη ἐστὶ Βιθυνία παρὰ τὸν Βόσπορον. ταχέως ἄρα ἐκπλεύσαντι τὸ στόμα τοῦ Πόντου ἢ ἑτέρα πλευρὰ τῆς Βιθυνίας· ἢ γὰρ Βιθυνία, ὡς προείρηται, περὶ τὸν Βόσπορόν ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ, ἐν ἀριστερᾷ δὲ Σαλμυδησὸς Θρακῶν ἀγρίων. ὠνομάσθη δὲ Σαλμυδησὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ συρρέοντος εἰς αὐτὸν ποταμοῦ. The note on Ἀχερουσιᾶς in 354 refers, among other authorities, to Herodorus of Heraclea and the *Periplus* of Andron of Teos, but the comment on the Chalybes is more striking: οἱ δὲ Χάλυβες ἔθνος Σκυθικὸν μετὰ τὸν Θερμῶδοντα, οἱ μέταλλα σιδήρου εὐρόντες μοχθοῦσι περὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν. ἐκλήθησαν δὲ Χάλυβες ἀπὸ Χάλυβος τοῦ Ἀρεως υἱοῦ. This note might have been taken straight out of Hecataeus, characteristic of whose style are the μετὰ τὸν Θερμῶδοντα²⁹ (an additional proof, if proof be needed, that Hecataeus in describing this coast went from west to east) and the etymology from Chalybs.

Similar characteristics mark the subsequent description of their voyage, which follows the prophecy of Phineus. There are some additions to the prophecy, for the sake of variety and completeness, which it is not necessary to enumerate here. One remark in the scholia, however, deserves mention: on Sesamus, in 941, is the note: Σήσαμος· πόλις Παφλαγονίας. Ὅμηρος (B 853) 'καὶ Σήσαμον ἀμφενέμοντο.' τὸ δὲ Σήσαμον μετωνομάσθη Ἀμαστρίς ἀπὸ Δαρείου ἀδελφοῦ θυγατρὸς. ἐκλήθη δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σήσαμον λαβεῖν (after which there is a lacuna). Here no authority is mentioned, but the note is in the style of Hecataeus, including the Homeric reference; and the change of name to Amastris would have taken place within his lifetime. If the scholiast goes back to an old Periegesis to find a statement about the Chalybes, though the tradition about them was perfectly familiar from later authors, and if he does the same when commenting on Sesamus, he is surely doing so in order to show how Apollonius conformed to the old traditions.

²⁹ Cf. frag. 48: μετὰ δὲ Ἐτοψ πόλις, μετὰ δὲ Λεσυρὸς ποταμός; frag. 73: μετὰ δὲ Κατάνη πόλις, ὑπὲρ δὲ ὅρος Αἴτνη; frag. 106: μετὰ δὲ Βούθρωτος πόλις, μετὰ δὲ Ὀρικός λιμὴν. Cf. also frags. 265, 266, 275.

So also in other geographical passages, describing parts of the voyage uninterrupted by any incident, it is likely that Apollonius is following the itinerary of an old Periegesis. It is indeed probable that he would do so, just as a modern poet writing about Elizabethan or earlier explorers would inevitably refer to Hakluyt's voyages and would very probably reproduce something of the flavour of the original. A passage worthy of examination is I, 580-608, which describes the voyage from Iolcus to Aphetae and thence to Lemnos. Here too the scholiasts have consulted various geographical authors: on *Τισαίη ἄκρη* (568) is the note *Τισαίη ἀκρωτήριον Θεσσαλίας ἢ Μαγνησίας, τινὲς δὲ τῆς Θεσπρωτίας*, and there are also some notes on the etymology of place names; the note on Lemnos and Myrina (601), with the remark about the origin of its name, recalls a fragment of Hecataeus.³⁰ Another geographical passage of the same kind is I, 922-35, which describes the voyage through the *Μέλας κόλπος* and the Hellespont. The scholiast's description of the Chersonese as *ἡ μετὰ Θράκην κειμένη* (925) is evidently borrowed from a Periegesis which went from west to east as Hecataeus' did. Interesting also is the poet's phrase *Ἀβαρνίδος ἡμαθόεσσαν ἥιονα* (932). The text of Stephanus *s. v.* *Ἀβαρνός* runs *Ἐκαταῖος δ' ὁ Μιλήσιος Λαμψάκου ἄκρην εἶναι φησιν* (frag. 220). Walter Leaf³¹ sought in vain for this *ἄκρη*, and it seems highly probable that Hecataeus wrote not *ἄκρη* but *ἀκτὴ* and that this is the source of Apollonius' *ἥιον*.³²

Two further reminiscences of Hecataeus in geographical

³⁰ Schol., I, 601-04a: . . . πόλις δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ Μυρίνη πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Λήμνου. δίπολις γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ Λήμνος· ἔχει γὰρ Ἡφαιστίαν καὶ Μύριναν. ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ Μυρίνης τῆς Θόαντος γυναικός, Κρηθέως δὲ θυγατρὸς. Hecataeus, frag. 138a: Steph. Byz., *s. v.* *Λήμνος*: νῆσος πρὸς τῇ Θράκῃ, δύο πόλεις ἔχουσα, Ἡφαιστίαν καὶ Μύριναν, ὡς Ἐκαταῖος Εὐρώπῃ. Frag. 138c: *ibid.*, *s. v.* *Μύρινα*: πόλις ἐν Λήμνῳ. Ἐκαταῖος Εὐρώπῃ. ἔστι καὶ τῆς Αἰολίδος ἄλλη. ἀπὸ Μυρίνης ἀμφοτέραι ἡ ἀπὸ Μυρίνου.

³¹ Strabo on the Troad, pp. 93-94.

³² Xen., *Hell.*, II, 1, 29 writes as follows: Κόνων δὲ ταῖς ἐννέα ναῦσι φεύγων, ἐπεὶ ἔγνω τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὰ πράγματα διεφθαρμένα, κατασχὼν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀβαρνίδα τὴν Λαμψάκου ἄκραν ἔλαβεν αὐτόθεν τὰ μεγάλα τῶν Λυσάνδρου νεῶν ἴστια. Thus it is not a rocky promontory but more like a sandy beach, though he does call it an *ἄκρα*. Steph. Byz., after quoting Hecataeus, continues: Ἐφορος δὲ (frag. 46) ἐν τῇ ε' λέγει κληθῆναι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Φωκῇ Ἰδῇ Ἀβαρνίδος ὑπὸ Φωκαέων τὴν Λάμψακον κτιζόντων. It is unfortunate that Ephorus' actual words are not recorded.

passages call for special attention. In IV, 660 Apollonius speaks of the heroes as

Αὔσονίης ἀκτὰς Τυρσηνίδος εἰσορόωντες,

and we know that Hecataeus called Nola, which in his time was held by the Etruscans, πόλις Αὔσονων.³³ Again the Καυλιακὸς σκόπελος in the Ister (IV, 324) recalls the Illyrian tribe of the Καυλικοί mentioned by Hecataeus.³⁴ Apollonius would naturally want to use words that suggested the ancient condition of the western world; it was natural that he should take such words from an author like Hecataeus and use them in a similar though not precisely identical way.

The affinity between Apollonius and Hecataeus is, however, not confined to the purely geographical passages. The two authors share a taste for aetiological legends explaining the origin of a city's name. This branch of mythology was also a favourite one among early logographers, some of whom wrote books on Κτίσεις, the legends associated with the founding of cities. Though the scholia contain far more of these legends than does the text of the *Argonautica*, it is not lacking in them: the foundation of Pellene by Pelles (I, 177), the λιμὴν Ἀργῶος in Aethalia (IV, 658), the origin of the water-carriers' race in Aegina (IV, 1765-72). The story of the foundation of Miletus, which Hecataeus must have mentioned, is confined to the scholia;³⁵ but Apollonius pays the city the compliment of calling it πολίεθρον ἀγαοῦ Μιλήτοιο as the city of Erginus (I, 186).

A development of this love of aetiological legends is the delight which Apollonius takes in pointing out geographical landmarks, especially σήματα and tombs, which recall and purport to prove the truth of legends. So also Herodotus claims to prove the truth of the miraculous repulse of the Persians from Delphi by pointing out the stones in the τέμενος of Athena Pronaea which were said to have fallen upon them from the

³³ Frag. 61: Steph. Byz., s. v. Νῶλα· πόλις Αὔσονων. Ἐκαταῖος Εὐρώπη. For the terminology used by Hecataeus in describing Italian towns see B. Schulze, *De Hecataei Milesii fragmentis quae ad Italiam meridionalem pertinent* (Diss. Leipzig, 1912).

³⁴ Frag. 92: *ibid.*, s. v. Καυλικοί· ἔθνος κατὰ τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον. Ἐκαταῖος Εὐρώπη. The scholiast maintains Ap. learnt about the Καυλιακὸς σκόπελος from Polemon ἐν Κτίσεσι Ἱταλικῶν καὶ Σικελικῶν πόλεων.

³⁵ Schol., I, 185-88a.

crag above.³⁶ This device of illustrating past history or legend by a landmark or monument that any traveller might see must have been a favourite one of the logographers. Even Thucydides uses it in his rare digressions, which are in the style of the logographers.³⁷ By referring to these *σήματα* in such various regions Apollonius shows his acquaintance with the type of literature that combined geography with mythology. At the beginning of the poem, for example, in introducing Orpheus, he speaks of the power of his song in Thrace:

φῆγοι δ' ἀγριάδες, κείνης ἔτι σήματα μολπῆς,
ἀκτῆς Ὀρηκίης Ζώνης ἐπὶ τηλεθόωσαι
ἐξείης στιχόωσιν ἐπήτριμοι, ἄς ὄγ' ἐπιπρὸ
θελγομένας φόρμυγι κατήγαγε Πιερίθεν (I, 28-31).

One may recollect that Hecataeus called Ζώνη a πόλις Κικόνων,³⁸ a name which recalls the *Odyssey* and might easily introduce further discussion of other myths. Again the tomb of Cyzicus is described as *σημα καὶ ὀψιγόνοισιν ιδέσθαι* (I, 1062), and the customs of the Ionians living in Cyzicus *ἔτι νῦν* recall the story of this king.³⁹ Where else but from an old geographer was Apollonius likely to have learned about the monument of Polyphemus in the land of the Chalybes (IV, 1476), the altar of Hecate in Paphlagonia set up by the Argonauts (IV, 250-52), or the tomb of Sthenelus, whose story the scholiast says he took from Promathidas (II, 911-14)?⁴⁰

His taste for using archaic place-names is another characteristic which he shares with the logographers, but this kind of antiquarianism is a common feature of Alexandrian writing and not very much stress can be laid on Apollonius' tendency to it. A few individual instances are nevertheless worth mentioning. *Εὐρυμέναι* in Thessaly, which the Argonauts see from the sea, is found in this form only in Hecataeus;⁴¹ other authors use the

³⁶ VIII, 39.

³⁷ E.g. his reference to inscriptions still readable in his digression about the Peisistratidae, VI, 54, 59.

³⁸ Frag. 161: Steph. Byz., s.v. Ζώνη· πόλις Κικόνων. Ἑκαταῖος Εὐρώπη.

³⁹ It is quite a mistake to argue (as Höfer does, *op. cit.*, p. 562) that this reference to customs prevalent *εἰσέτι νῦν* denotes the poet's use of a contemporary source.

⁴⁰ Cf. also II, 855; IV, 535, 550, 1151, 1473, 1618-20.

⁴¹ I, 595; Hec., frag. 136.

form Ἐρύμναι.⁴² Ephyra as an old name for Corinth is found in Hecataeus,⁴³ and in a digression describing the later colonization of Corcyra by the Corinthians Apollonius speaks of the

Βακχιάδαι, γενεὴν Ἐφύρηθεν ἑόντες (IV, 1212).

The scholiast in telling the story at greater length mentions no authority, but it is noteworthy that the style of his note conforms in a remarkable manner to the narrative style of Herodotus (though it is not written in the Ionic dialect): Μέλισσος εὐεργετήσας τοὺς Κορινθίους—μέλλοντας γὰρ ὑπὸ Φεΐδωνος τοῦ τῶν Ἀργείων βασιλέως διαφθαρῆναι ἐρρύσατο—τιμῆς ἡξιώθη παρ' αὐτοῖς. <...> καὶ ποτε οἱ Βακχιάδαι νυκτὸς ἐπελθόντες τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Ἀκταίωνος ἐβούλοντο ἀποσπᾶν τὸν παῖδα· τῶν δὲ γονέων ἀντεχόντων συνέβη διασπασθῆναι τὸν Ἀκταίωνα. μελλόντων δὲ τῶν Ἰσθμίων ἀγεσθαι, στὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ὁ Μέλισσος πολλὰ τοῖς Κορινθίοις κατηράσατο, ἔὰν μὴ τὸν τοῦ παιδὸς ἐκδικήσωσι θάνατον. ταῦτα εἰπὼν εἰς τὸν προκείμενον κρημνὸν ἑαυτὸν ἔβαλεν. οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι εὐλαβούμενοι ἀνεκδίκητον καταλιπεῖν τὸν τοῦ Ἀκταίωνος θάνατον, ἅμα μὲν καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ κελεύοντος, ἐξέβαλον τοὺς Βακχιάδας.⁴⁴ This story is told with more liveliness and more literary grace than is commonly found in the scholia, and it may be remembered that Dionysius of Halicarnassus points out how the old logographers were not without a certain charm and grace.⁴⁵ Again the use of Apis as an old name for the Peloponnese prompts the scholiast to write a note which very closely resembles the style of other fragments of Hecataeus: Ἀπὶς νῆσος κειμένη πρὸ τῆς Κρήτης· Μινωίων δὲ πέλαγος πρὸ τῆς Κρήτης, αὕτη γὰρ Μίνωος ἦν βασιλεία· ἥ ἐπεὶ θαλασσοκρατῶν ὑφ' αὐτὸν τὰς νήσους ἐποίησε. μετὰ δὲ τὸ Κρητικὸν τὸ Αἰγύπτιον.⁴⁶ The note which follows, raising the old question of the division into continents, likewise recalls Hecataeus as well as the polemic in Herodotus: ἡ δὲ Αἰγυπτὸς κατὰ μὲν τινὰς τῆς Ἀσίας ἐστὶ, κατὰ δὲ τινὰς τῆς Λιβύης.⁴⁷ Hecataeus was famous for regarding Egypt as part of Asia, because he accepted only two continents, Europe and Asia.

⁴² Cf. Delage, *op. cit.*, p. 81; Philippon in *RE*, s. v. Ἐρυνμέναι.

⁴³ Frag. 120: Steph. Byz., s. v. Κόρινθος· πόλις ἔσω τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ τῆς Πελοποννήσου. Ἐκαταῖος Εὐρώπῃ. ἡ αὐτὴ ἐκαλεῖτο Ἐφύρα ἀπὸ Ἐφύρας τῆς Μύρμηκος τῆς Ἐπιμηθέως γυναικός.

⁴⁴ Schol., IV, 1212-14a.

⁴⁵ *De Thuc.*, 5.

⁴⁶ Schol., IV, 1564a.

⁴⁷ Schol., IV, 1569; Hdt., II, 16.

Purely mythological details taken from the *Genealogies* of Hecataeus are not easily established, though there are two which the scholia explicitly claim: the ram of Phrixus which spoke with a human voice⁴⁸ and Athena's title of Itonis in Thessaly which Apollonius gave her when calling the Argo *ἔργον Ἀθηναίης Ἰτωνίδος*.⁴⁹ It is important to note that his version of the homeward voyage of the Argonauts is certainly different from that of Hecataeus. The scholiast writes: *Ἐκαταῖος δὲ ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐκ τοῦ Φάσιδος διελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ὠκεανόν, εἴτα ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὸν Νεῖλον, ὅθεν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν θάλασσαν*.⁵⁰ Thus we have no reason to suppose that the fantastic geography of Europe, with its amazing river system, which Apollonius presents is based on Hecataeus. But there are a number of very interesting points in this description, beginning at IV, 259, which call for careful consideration. This passage, more than any other, seems to show the use which Apollonius made of earlier writers and how he was able to profit from what they wrote without merely copying from them.

Apollonius introduces his fantastic geography as follows:

ἔστιν γὰρ πλὺτος ἄλλος, ὃν ἀθανάτων ἱερῆς
πέφραδον, οἱ Θήβης Τριτωνίδος ἐκγεγάασιν.
οὔπω τέρεα πάντα, τά τ' οὐρανῷ εἰλίσσονται,
οὔδ' ἐγὼ Δαναῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἦεν ἀκοῦσαι
πευθομένοις. οἳ δ' ἔσαν Ἀρκάδες Ἀπιδανῆες,
Ἀρκάδες οἱ καὶ πρόσθε σεληναίης ὑδέονται
ζῶειν, φηγὸν ἔδοντες ἐν οὐρεσιν (IV, 259-65).

This mention of the Egyptian priests as the source of a fantastic story will come as a shock to those who have recently read Professor Heidel's remarkable monograph on "Hecataeus and the Egyptian priests in Herodotus Book II,"⁵¹ for the thesis of this essay is that, when Herodotus quotes the authority of

⁴⁸ Schol., I, 256-59: *ἡ δὲ ἱστορία κεῖται παρ' Ἐκαταίῳ, ὡς ὁ κριὸς ἐλάλησεν* (Hecataeus, frag. 17).

⁴⁹ Schol., I, 551a: *Ἰτωνίης Ἀθηναίης ἔστιν ἱερὸν ἐν Κορωνείᾳ τῆς Βοιωτίας. ὁ μὲντοι Ἀπολλώνιος οὐκ ἂν λέγοι τὴν Ἀθηναίαν ἐπὶ κατασκευῇ τῆς Ἀργεῖος ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Κορωνείᾳ ἐπικλήσεως, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπὸ Θεσσαλικῆς Ἰτωνίης, περὶ ἧς Ἐκαταῖος μὲν ἐν τῇ α' τῶν Ἱστοριῶν* (Hec., frag. 2).

⁵⁰ Schol., IV, 257-62b (Hec., frag. 18a). The other scholion on the same point (IV, 282-91b, Hec., frag. 18b) is almost certainly corrupt.

⁵¹ See note 16 above.

these priests, he is in reality following Hecataeus, who in his turn quoted them—though without ever himself having had conversation with them any more than Herodotus had! This passage, then, if it could be shown that it had its origin in Hecataeus, might be used in support of such a thesis. But there are other and simpler explanations possible. Plato introduces the legend of Atlantis by making Egyptian priests tell it to Solon, and there was nothing unusual in pretending that their knowledge of prehistoric times was more trustworthy than that of the Greeks. Apollonius, then, is deliberately setting out to give a specious appearance of antiquity to his description. So he refers to the Egyptians, calls the Nile Triton (supposedly an older name than Νεῖλος), uses other archaic terms like Πελασγίς χθών (265), 'Ηερίη for Egypt (270), and so leads on to the story of Sesostris which, like Herodotus, he represents as a purely Egyptian story.⁵²

Indeed this whole introduction resembles a parody or a humorous adaptation of the logographer's style, the kind of thing that was doubtless written by Dionysius Scytobrachion,⁵³ and may have been attempted by many other Alexandrian writers. The map set up in Aeaea (279-81) recalls the famous map of Hecataeus⁵⁴ and the map which Aristagoras showed to Cleomenes;⁵⁵ and the appeal to such a graven monument is intended to give the story an air of antiquity. The introduction is in fact an elaborate device to give a pretence of genuineness to the fantastic geography which follows. Curious ideas about the Danube may have been frequent enough, but none quite so curious as those which make possible the story of the Argonauts' return. Words deliberately reminiscent of old Ionian writers are chosen, like διετεκμήραντο⁵⁶ (which recalls Herodotus'

⁵² Heidel (*op. cit.*, pp. 71-75) argues that this story is of Greek origin and that Herodotus (II, 102-11) got it from Hecataeus. See also his earlier article, "A suggestion concerning Plato's Atlantis," *Proc. of Amer. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, 68, pp. 217 ff.

⁵³ Cf. E. Schwartz in *RE*, s. v. Dionysius (109) *Scytobrachion*.

⁵⁴ Strabo, I, 1, 11: γράμμα πιστούμενον ἐκείνου εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἄλλης αὐτοῦ γραφῆς.

⁵⁵ Hdt., V, 49: . . . χάλκεον πίνακα ἐν τῷ γῆς ἀπάσης περιόδου ἐνετέμνητο καὶ θάλασσά τε πᾶσα καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες.

⁵⁶ 282-84: ἔστι δὲ τις ποταμός, ὕπατον κέρας Ὠκεανοῖο, εὐρύς τε προβαθὴς τε καὶ ὀλκάδι νῆι περῆσαι.
Ἴστρον μιν καλέοντες ἐκὰς διετεκμήραντο.

remarks about the Nile and Danube)⁵⁷ and παρακέλνται⁵⁸ (a word used by Hecataeus in describing the position of Media relative to the Caspian Gates).⁵⁹

The scholia reveal, moreover, that Apollonius has taken various names from various geographical authorities. Their attempt to trace down the sources of the story of the flight and to sort out the various geographical opinions results merely in a collection of irrelevant information. They certainly present a formidable array of names, authors of *Τῆς Περίοδοι* and *Κτίσεις*, but nothing emerges from a study of these names. It is their notes on the individual names of places that are illuminating. They can cite Aeschylus as a source for the Rhipaeian mountains; and Eratosthenes, so they tell us, mentioned the island of Peuce in the Danube,⁶⁰ which according to him was as large as Rhodes—but Herodotus had already spoken of islands in that river as large as Lesbos.⁶¹ But Apollonius has many details in his description for which the scholiasts can find no authority, though they do their best, striving to trace the *Σινδοί* (321-22), the *Ἀγγοῦρον ὄρος*, and the *Καυλιακὸς σκόπελος* (323-26).⁶² It is unfortunate that it is not made clear how much use Apollonius made of Timagetus' *Περὶ λιμένων*.⁶³

The scholia offer no authority for the *Βρύγοι*, calling them simply *ἔθνος Ἰλλυρίας*,⁶⁴ or for the island of Electris⁶⁵ or for the story of how the Colchians who survived the massacre settled:

οἱ μὲν ἐπ' αὐτῶν νήσων ἔβαν, ἦσιν ἔπεσχόν
ἦρωες, ναίουσι δ' ἐπ' ὠνυμοὶ Ἀψύρτοιο.
οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἰλλυρικοῖο μελαμβαθέος ποταμοῖο,

⁵⁷ II, 33: τοῖσι ἐμφάνεσι τὰ μὴ γινωσκόμενα τεκμαιρόμενος.

⁵⁸ The Trinacrian sea

γαίῃ δὲ ὑμετέρῃ παρακέλνται, εἰ ἐτεὸν δὴ
ὑμετέρης γαίης Ἀχελώϊος ἐξανήσιν (292-93).

⁵⁹ Frag. 286: χώρα ταῖς Κασπίαις παρακεκλιμένη πύλαις.

⁶⁰ Schol., IV, 282-91b.

⁶¹ Schol., IV, 311; Hdt., I, 202.

⁶² Cf. *RE*, s. v. *Sindoi*, Ἀγγοῦρον ὄρος, Καυλιακὸς σκόπελος.

⁶³ The scholia refer to this author six times (see Wendel's index).

⁶⁴ IV, 470.

⁶⁵ IV, 505: αὕτη ἡ Ἡλεκτρὶς ἐγγύς ἐστι τοῦ Ἡριδάνου ποταμοῦ. The fact that Theopompus mentioned the *Ἡλεκτρίδες* is indeed an argument that they were mentioned by older geographers (Frag. 130—Ps.-Scymnus, 369-74).

τύμβος ἴν' Ἀρμονίης Κάδμοιό τε, πύργον ἔδειμαν
 ἀνδράσιν Ἐγγελέσσιν ἐφέστιοι· οἱ δ' ἐν ὄρεσσιν
 ἐνναίουσιν, ἅπερ τε Κεραύνια κυκλήσκονται (514-19).

Of the Ὑλλῆες, the first tribe which the heroes reached after the rout of the Colchians (524), the scholiast says only *ἔθνος περὶ τὴν Ἰλλυρίαν ἀπὸ Ὑλλου*. Certainly the style of these notes is reminiscent of the fragments of Hecataeus; and the Enchelees, among whom some of the Colchians settled, find their place among the Illyrian tribes in the *Periegesis*.⁶⁶ But the scholiasts are evidently mystified by the fantastic story, and after a while give up the attempt to explain what its sources may be, since the details appear to come from such various quarters; in the end they are content to point out that this name or that is familiar.

So also modern scholars studying the story are inclined to conclude that Apollonius takes various details from various sources. Delage⁶⁷ points out how Timagetus (this mysterious author frequently cited in the scholia) believed in a Mediterranean mouth of the Danube; and one can well believe that even in the time of Apollonius, when Central European geography was still a closed book to the Greeks, this belief was still entertained by some and scoffed at by others. It is harder to believe that the existence of the Alps was unknown in Alexandrian circles and that educated people believed in the joining of the Rhône and the Po;⁶⁸ but Euripides, according to Pliny,⁶⁹ lent literary authority to this belief. It is possible to go right through the text of the *Argonautica* and, with the help of the scholia, tabulate information of this kind, some of which is probably not relevant. But Apollonius has to add some original invention of his own before he can combine the details, and the mixture of fable and science which results is inexplicable except on the supposition that it is designed to represent early ideas of geography. Apollonius is enough of an Alexandrian not to invent something *ἀμάρτυρον* when he can find authoritative testimony. Some of the details, therefore, are taken from

⁶⁶ Frag. 103.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 225.

⁶⁸ But cf. J. Partsch, "Die Stromgabelungen der Argonautensage," *Berichte der sächsischen Akad.*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 71 (1919), Heft 2.

⁶⁹ Pliny, *N. H.*, XXXVII, 2. Cf. Schol. Dion. *Perieg.*, 289.

geographical sources; and it is his acquaintance with geographical literature that enables him to use these as a means of giving an air of reality to the story.

If this conclusion is correct, the use which Apollonius made of his knowledge of early geographical literature is clearly revealed. The idea of combining geography and mythology goes as far back as Hecataeus (possibly even beyond him to Aristaeus of Proconnesus, who finds no mention in the scholia). A number of geographical details were taken by Apollonius from old geographers, and with these details went certain characteristics of style and even of vocabulary. The use of this information from old sources lent an air of antiquity to his description. When he came to Central Europe, however, his sources failed him. There is no indication that Hecataeus and the other early authors of *Periegeses* ever went far beyond the coast of Western Europe, except in speaking of the circumambient ocean and the great rivers like the Ister and the Eridanus; but even here there was no detailed information to be found and, since the country was in any case unfamiliar to the Greeks of Alexandria, the poet could give free rein to his imagination; which indeed he did, calling upon the muses to bear the burden of his story and quoting the imaginary authority of Egyptian priests, whose knowledge was supposed to antedate the ages when the Greeks first came to the Mediterranean.

LIONEL PEARSON.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY,
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

CONCERNING GOTHIC INTRANSITIVE VERBS.

I. Gothic *siukan* "to be sick" : *siuks* "sick"; an Isolated Type of Strong Verb.

The Goth. verb *siukan* is strong (cf. *hwas siukip*, *ris áðθevēi*, k. 11, 29). It represents a semantically isolated type of verb in that verbs denoting a state of mind or body are otherwise regularly weak.¹ Since the corresponding adjective *siuks* existed, we should expect the strong verb *siukan* to have been supplanted by a weak verb² derived from the adjective just as in the later Germ. languages (cf. OHG *siuhhan* < **siuhjan* : *siuhhēn* : *siechōn* from the adj. *siuh* : *sioh*; MHG *sochēn* < **sukēn* : ON *sokna* from the stem **suk-* with low grade vowel; ON *sjúkna* from the adj. *sjúkr*).

The Goth. verb *siukan* occurs only in the present tense. The question therefore arises as to why in the past tense the adjective *siuks* plus the substantive verb entirely supplanted the verb *siukan*, especially since both translated the same Grk. verb *ἀσθενῆν* (cf. *hwas siukip*, *jah ni siukau*, *ris áðθevēi*, *kaì oúk áðθevō*, k. 11, 29; *siuks was*,³ *ἡσθέλει*, J. 11, 2).

This substitution for the verb *siukan* of the adjective *siuks* plus the substantive verb in the past tense points towards the conclusion that the strong verb *siukan* denoting a state of body ("sick") was already felt as an anomaly⁴ and hence the pre-

¹ Cf. *faúrhtjan* (without the reflexive *sik*) "to be afraid" : adj. *faúrhts*; [*ga-*] *bleipjan* "to be merciful, have mercy" : adj. *bleips*, etc.

² That is, either by **siukjan* = OHG *-siuhhan* or by *siukan* : **siukaida* (cf. OHG *richēn* "to be rich" ; adj. *richi* "rich" ; *armēn* "to be poor" : adj. *arm* "poor" = Goth. *-arman* : *-armaida* : adj. **arms*).

³ This phrase *siuks was* (*ἡσθέλει*) is omitted by M. Metlen, *JEGPh.*, 32, 535-7, in his list of *More Words in One Language than in the Other for the Same Idea*. The phrase occurs J. 11, 2; 3; 6; R. 8, 3; k. 11, 21; Ph. 2, 27.

⁴ This is supported by the fact that the strong verb *siukan* was in the later Germ. languages (OHG-MHG) entirely supplanted by the denominative weak verb.

Compare the strong verb *keinan*, **kai*, [*us-*] *kijanata* (L. 8, 6) which developed the weak preterite form [*us-*] *keinōda* (L. 8, 8). The strong form **kai* was an anomaly because otherwise the stem of verbs belonging to the 1st ablaut series did not end in a vowel. The reason for the disappearance of **sauk* is, of course, not parallel to that of **kai* but it

terite forms **sauk* : **sukum* with ablaut variation were avoided. Its retention in the present tense may be explained as due to the influence of the corresponding adjective *siuks* with the same ablaut vowel as in *siukan*, possibly enhanced by the adjectival usage of the present participle *siukands* (κακῶς ἔχων L. 7, 2; νοσῶν T. 6, 4).

If the phrases *siuks was* (ἡσθέει J. 11, 2, R. 8, 3; ἀσθενεῖ J. 11, 6; ἡσθένησεν Ph. 2, 27) : *siukai wēseima ἡσθενήσαμεν* k. 11, 21) for **sauk* : **sukeima* represent a case of stylistic variation, this variation may be due to the anomalous character of the verb *siukan*.

II. Gothic wakan, **wōk* : **wakaida*?

Jellinek (*Geschichte der got. Sprache*, § 201) raises the question whether Goth. *wakan* represented the strong verb in spite of ON *vaka*, *vakta* : OHG *wahhēn*, but without justification.

The tendency to the *ē*-formation evident in ON *vaka* : OHG *wahhēn* appears in Goth. **wōkan*, **wōkaida* which must be postulated from the verbal substantive *wōkains** (*wōkainim* k. 6, 5; 11, 27). If the Gothic had preserved PG **wakēn* (= *vaka* : OHG *wahhēn*) we should have expected a verbal substantive **wakains* instead of *wōkains**.

It is evident then that Goth. **wōkan*, **wōkaida* took the place of PG **wakēn* and therefore that ON *vaka* : OHG *wahhēn* do not support a Goth. *wakan*, **wakaida*. Since Goth. **wōkan* represented a durative *ē*-verb there is no reason for postulating another durative *ē*-verb *wakan* : **wakaida*, alongside **wōkan*, especially since we have no verbal substantive **wakains*. The WGerm. *ō(j)*-verb OHG *wahhōn* : OS *wakon*, OE *wacian* does not represent another weak durative verb in addition to **wakēn* (ON *vaka* : OHG *wahhēn*) but simply the secondary tendency for *ō*-verbs to interchange with *ē*-verbs.

Jellinek has not mentioned in connection with this question the verbal substantive *wōkains** which affords the only evidence within the Gothic of the *ē*-verb. The verb **wōkan*, **wōkaida* supports the strong conjugation of *wakan*, **wōk* (= OE *wóc*)—**wōkan*, an *ē*-verb, derived from **wōk*, originally a perfect

shows, like **kai*, that an anomalous form gives rise to a substitute form or expression.

tense⁵ — and at the same time lends evidence against the existence of a Goth. verb *wakan*, **wakaida* inasmuch as the durative *ē*-verb could hardly have existed in two forms, one with the low grade vowel *a* and the other with the high grade vowel *ō*, and with exactly the same meaning. If this had been the case, one or the other would have disappeared (cf. *wōkains** not **wakains*).

III. Gothic *-waknan*, **wōk* : **waknōda*?

Jellinek (*ibid.*) likewise raises the question whether the inchoative verb *-waknan* corresponds to ON *vakna* or to OE *wæcnan*, *wóc* but again, as it seems to me, without justification.

OE *wæcnan* : *wóc* (< **waknan* : *wōk*) "awaken" represents the original inchoative function of the verb. Since, however, the inchoative *n*-suffix was restricted to the present tense (cf. Goth. *fraihnan*, *frāh*) the preterite form **wōk* could have represented a *durative* function ("I watched; was on the watch; was watchful, awake") as well as the original *inchoative* function ("I became awake, watchful; I awoke" = OE *wóc*).

From the preterite form **wōk* a new present strong form *wakan* (without the inchoative *n*-suffix) was formed in Goth., denoting the corresponding durative function of **wōk*. The result of the new present tense *wakan* was that the preterite form **wōk* could no longer function as an inchoative verb but remained restricted to its durative function. This restriction necessarily led to a new preterite form of the inchoative *-waknan*. The original preterite form **wōk* was therefore discarded in favor of **waknōda* (= ON *vaknaða*) after the example of the

⁵ Cf. F. Specht, "Zur Geschichte der Verbalklasse auf *-ē*," *Zfogl. Sprachf.*, 62, 71-2. Specht here refers to ON *vakinn* as evidence of a strong verb **vaka*. This represents the current view but I do not believe that ON *vak-inn* "awake" necessarily represents a past part. of a lost verb **vaka* str. The lack of the palatal *ki*-umlaut—we should have expected **vekin*—points towards a secondary formation. There is nothing in the way of assuming that *vak-inn* represents an adj. outside the verbal system, derived from the stem *vak-* as in the inf. *vaka* (*ē*-verb), i. e., *vak-inn* "watchful, awake" : *vak-a* "to watch" (cf. *geym-inn* "heedful, attentive" : *geym-a* "to heed"; *gæt-inn* "watchful" : *gæt-a* "to watch over, attend," etc.). Cf. my article "Old Norse *tig-inn* : *tig-inn* : *fú-inn* : *lú-inn*," *SSN*, 10, 50-55.

inchoative *nōn*-verbs. OE *wacnode* (for *wóc*) shows a parallel development.

In WGerm., on the other hand, the durative strong verb (= Goth. *wakan*) did not exist but was represented by the *ē*- or the *ō(j)*-verb; OHG *wahhēn*, *wahhōn* = OS *wakon*, OE *wacian*. Hence it is clear why OE *wóc* retained its inchoative function and why *wæcnan* (= Goth. *-waknan*) did not follow the example of the *nōn*-verbs, i. e., because the preterite form *wóc* remained inchoative. Besides, the *nōn*-class in WGerm. was not so distinctively developed as in Gothic⁶ - ON.⁷

The discrepancy to which Jellinek calls attention is, therefore, only apparent. OE *wæcnan* : *wóc* represents the original status (prehistorical Goth. **waknan*, **wōk*) whereas ON *vakna*, *vaknaða* represents the secondary status which developed in Goth. (*-waknan*, *-*waknōða*) in order to differentiate the preterite form of the inchoative verb *-waknan* from that of the new durative verb *wakan*.

IV. Gothic *riqizjan** "finster werden, sich verfinstern"?

According to the current view the denominative intransitive verb **riqizjan* (*riqis-z*) has an inchoative sense "finster werden, sich verfinstern."

The verb occurs only once (Mk. 13, 24): *sauil riqizeip*, ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται. The Grk. original means "The sun will be made dark." If the Goth. verb *riqizeip* corresponds in sense to the Grk. verb σκοτισθήσεται (future passive of σκοτίζω "make dark" : σκότος "darkness"), then *riqizeip* must have an inchoative sense "will be made (= will become) dark."

Since, however, we have no evidence that intransitive *jan*-verbs are primarily inchoative,⁸ it is a question whether *riqizeip* here has an inchoative sense "will become dark." The intransitive denominative *jan*-verbs are otherwise without exception durative in sense (cf. *bleips* : [ga-] *bleipjan* "sich erbarmen, to be merciful"; *fulls* : *ufar-fulljan* (K. 15, 58) "überfüllt sein, to be full to overflowing"; *ufarassus* : *ufarassjan* "im

⁶ Cf. *us-keinan*, **-kai* : *keinōða*.

⁷ Cf. *fregna*, *frá* : *fregnaða*; *sporna*, *sparn* : *spornaða*.

⁸ The inchoative sense of intransitive *jan*-verbs is due to their usage with a prefix (cf. *in-rauhtjan* "get into a state of anger, become angry," *in-gramjan* "to become bitter," etc.).

Überfluss vorhanden sein, to *be* in excess"; *siponeis* : *siponjan* "Schüler sein, to *be* a disciple"; *rign* : *rignjan* "regnen, to rain," *balps* : *balpjan* "kühn sein, to *be* brave," etc.).

It is hardly possible that *rigizeip* here represents a causative *jan*-verb, in which case it would represent an impersonal usage with *sauil* as its object (i. e., *sauil rigizeip*, "It will darken the sun = The sun will be darkened"), for we have no such examples of an impersonal causative verb denoting *natural* phenomena.⁹

The evidence then points to the conclusion that the verb *rigizeip* here represents the regular *durative* intransitive denominative *jan*-verb "will *be* dark" and that the Goth. translator has thus inaccurately rendered the Grk. original. Otherwise why was the regular inchoative *n*-suffix not utilized (i. e., *sauil *rigizniþ*)? ¹⁰ If Goth. *rigizeip* is of IE origin and with Feist (*Etym. Wtb. der got. Spr.*, 217) to be equated with OI *rajasyāti* "es *wird* dunkel," it seems strange that the Goth. translator did not discard the form *rigizeip* in favor of **rigizniþ* ¹¹ in which the *n*-suffix clearly differentiates the inchoative from the durative sense, especially since the intransitive *jan*-verbs were otherwise always durative in sense.

V. Gothic *judaiwiskōn* "to live like a Jew."

The verb *judaiwiskōn* (**judaiwisks* : *judaiwiskō*) was coined to translate the Grk. verb *iovdaïζω*. Since the Goth. verb was

⁹ *Rignjan** in M. 5, 45, *rigneip* (βρέχει) *ana garaihtans* is personal; [*sa attā*] *rigneip*, "He [the Father] rains (= makes it rain) on the just."

¹⁰ Cf. the corresponding phrase in the ON *Völusp.* 57, 1: *sól tér sortna* "The sun will *become* dark."

ON *røkkva*, — : — *røkkvit* "to grow dark," although the extant forms (*røkkv* 3rd pers. sing. pres.) are ambiguous, most likely represents a strong verb of the 5th ablaut series (cf. Noreen, *Aisl. Grm.*⁴, § 498) and not a *jan*-verb parallel to Goth. **rigizjan*.

¹¹ That Wulfila, however, did not always differentiate the durative intransitive verb from the inchoative verb of the Grk. original is clear from L. 1, 53 *gabignands* ("those who have *become* rich") = *πλουτοῦντας* "those who *are* rich" (*πλουτεῖν* "to *be* rich") over against k. 9, 11 *in allamma gabignandans*, *ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι* "being enriched (= becoming enriched) in everything."

The verb *gabignan* cannot in the first passage mean "reich sein" in conformity with the Grk. but "reich werden." In his *Vocabulary of Die Got. Bibel*³ Streithberg gives the meaning of *gabignan* as "reich sein" but in his *Got. Grm.* (§ 219, b) correctly as "reich werden."

intransitive and durative in sense it naturally was formed as an *ōn*-verb after the pattern of such intransitive denominative verbs (with suffix syllable) as *þiud-an-ōn* (*þiud-ans*) "to be king," *frauj-in-ōn* (*frauja*) "to be lord, reign," etc. which likewise denote a manner of living or being.

Aside from *judaiwiskōn* we have in Gothic only one other *iskōn*-verb, viz. *aiwiskōn*, ἀσχημονεῖν, "to treat shamefully" and its compound *ga-aiwiskōn*, κατασχύνειν "to put to shame, abuse" (*aiwiski*, n. *ja*-stem, αἰσχύνη "shame"; *un-aiwisks*, ἀπεπαισχυντός "without shame, unblemished").

The formal resemblance between these two verbs *aiwiskōn* and *judaiwiskōn* consists not only in the suffix *-isk* but also in the previous syllable *-aiw-* (*-áiw-* : *-ěw-*). This formal resemblance may have been a contributing factor to the coining of *judaiwiskōn* as an *ōn*-verb, but as shown above, the *ōn*-verb *judaiwiskōn* is, on account of its intransitive durative character, justified without assuming any influence on the part of the verb *aiwiskōn*. However, since both are *isk*-verbs they cannot formally be separated from each other and this fact leads us to the question as to why the native denominative verb from *aiwiski* was an *ōn*-verb (*aiwiskōn*).

Since the substantive *ja*-stem *aiwiski* "shame" existed (but no *ō(n)*-stem **aiwisk-a-*, *-ō*) we should have expected a *jan*-verb **aiwiskjan* "to treat shamefully." Since *aiwiskōn* represents the only native *iskōn*-verb in Gothic we must turn to the other Germ. languages for a solution of the *iskōn*-verb. Here the conditions in ON afford us some light.

In ON all the denominative *isk-* (> *sk-*) verbs are *ōn*-verbs; viz. *elska* "to love," *heimska* "to make a fool of, mock," *lymskask* "to act cunningly," and *illska* "to be ugly, wicked," four in number. In my article "The Suffix *-sk-* in Old Norse *Elska*," (*A. J. P.*, XLIX (1928), pp. 188-195) I explained the *ōn*-conjugation of these verbs as due to the fact that they were derived not from the corresponding adjectives (*elskr*, *heimskr*, *lymskr*, **illskr*) but from the corresponding *ōn*-substantives (*elska*, *heimska*, *lymska*, *illska*). With this secondary *iskōn*-type in ON we may compare the original *sk*-verbs¹² (with IE *sk*-suffix), OHG *eiscōn* (*eisca*), *forscōn* (*forsca*).

¹² Cf. Goth. *fiskōn* : ON *fiska*, *-aða* : OHG *fiskōn* (Lat. *piscāri*) with original *-sk-* of the stem. This IE denominative *ājō*-type may have (on

These conditions in ON point to the conclusion that the *isk-*verbs in Gothic were likewise *ōn-*verbs derived from the corresponding *ō(n)*-substantives. This original *iskōn*-type does not occur in our Gothic texts but the assumption of its existence (in common with ON) could explain the *ōn*-verb *aiwiskōn* as an analogical formation; i. e., that *aiwiskōn* was formed after the pattern of these *iskōn*-verbs (preserved in ON) derived from the corresponding *ō(n)*-substantives in spite of the corresponding *ja*-stem *aiwiski*. At any rate, Goth. *aiwiskōn* cannot formally be separated from the ON *ska*-type which always appears as an *ōn*-verb.

To return to *judaiwiskōn*, whether this newly coined verb stood under the influence of *aiwiskōn* and thus followed the (lost) *iskōn*-type or not, the *ōn*-formation was in keeping with the intransitive durative sense of the verb. It is, however, most likely that both these factors (the *iskōn*-type and the intransitive usage) were involved, especially since *judaiwiskōn*, like *aiwiskōn*, contained a *w* before the *isk*-suffix. The *-aiwiskōn* of *judaiwiskōn* was phonetically identical with *aiwiskōn*¹³ except for the vowel *ai* = *ě*.

The whole question of the denominative *isk*-verbs in Germ. should receive a thorough treatment. I find no mention of this verbal type in Wissmann's monograph "Nomina Postverbalia in den germ. Sprachen, I. Teil: Deverbative *ō*-Verba," *Ergänzungsheft zur Zfugl. Sprachf.*, Nr. 11, 1932.

VI. Gothic *blōtan* (λατρεύειν, σέβεισθαι) "to worship."

The verb *blōtan* is used transitively in T. 2, 10 *gub blōtan* (*gub* object of the substantivized inf. *blōtan*) = Grk. θεοσέβεια "godliness" and in Mk. 7, 7 *ip sware mik blōtand*, μάτην δὲ σέβονται με, "But in vain do they worship me."

account of the *-sk-* of the stem) had a contributory influence on the later verbal formations with suffix *-skō* and *-iskō* (cf. ON *fiska*, *-aða* : *elska-aða*; OHG *fiscōn* : *eiscōn* : *foriscōn*).

¹³ It will be noted that the Goth. scribe has translated the Grk. νηπιάζειν "to be like a child (*νήπιος*), be childish," by *barnisks wisan* not **barniskōn* (cf. νηπιάζετε, *barniskai sijaiþ*, K. 14, 20), which is additional evidence that the newly coined verb *judaiwiskōn* stood under the influence of *aiwiskōn*; otherwise we should have expected *judaiwisks wisan* = *louðatʒein*, "be like a Jew, be Jewish."

In L. 2, 37 *bidōm blōtande*, δειῆσει λατρεύονσα, "worshipping in prayer" the verb is used without an object and hence may be construed either transitively with an object (*gub*) understood or in the so-called "absolute" function, equivalent to a *durative intransitive* verb "performing worship, rendering religious service" (cf. OE *goðum blōtan* "to render service to the gods").

There is no reason why we should not assume that the Goth. verb *blōtan* could be used in this intransitive durative sense of "performing a religious sacrifice" (cf. ON-OE *blót*, "sacrifice") especially since it is possible that the verb *blōtan* may represent a weak verb of the *ai*-class¹⁴ which may denote the intransitive function.

Assuming then that *blōtan* could be used in this intransitive sense, we may easily explain the irregular verbal abstract *blōt-inassus* (θρησκεία, λατρεία) "worship" as due to the influence of the type *gudj-inassus* derived from *gudj-inōn* (*gudja*). The *inōn*-verbs denoted primarily a durative intransitive function¹⁵ "to carry out an office"; *gudja* "priest," *gudj-inōn* "to act in the capacity of priest," *gudj-inassus* "acting in the capacity of a priest" > "priesthood"; hence *blōtan* "to perform the service of a heathen priest" (cf. ON *blót-maðr*) : *blōt-inassus* "performing the service of a priest" > "worship."

Von Bahder (*Verbalabstracta*, 116) rightly doubts the existence of a verb **blōtinōn* but he has failed to give the reason for this, viz. that the form *blōtan* could have exactly the same meaning as **blōtinōn* "to perform a religious service," which fact renders the assumption of a verb **blōtinōn* unnecessary.

Since the verbal suffix *-inassus* was derived from *inōn*-verbs, it is quite natural that this suffix should be extended to any verbal stem which, like the *inōn*-verbs, denoted a durative intransitive usage. We have, e. g., the adjective *wans* "lacking," *wan-ains* "a lacking, want" (verb **wanan*, **wanaida* "to lack," cf. ON *vana*, OE *wanian*, OHG *wanōn*, all *ōn*-verbs), hence *wan-innassus* "a lacking, want." Here again Von Bahder (*ibid.*) rightly doubts the existence of a verb **waninōn* but he

¹⁴ Cf. the ON denominative verb *blóta*, *blótaða* (from the subs. *blót*) which could originally have meant only "to perform a *blót* = heathen sacrifice" > "to worship."

¹⁵ The intransitive *inōn*-verbs could, of course, become transitive (cf. *leikeis* "doctor," *leikinōn* "to be a doctor" > "to cure" = θεραπεύειν).

fails to see that it is the intransitive durative sense of the verbal stem *wan-* "to lack" which renders the assumption of a verb **waninōn* unnecessary for the formation of the verbal abstract *wan-inassus*.

The evidence then points towards the conclusion that both *waninassus* and *blōtinassus* are of analogical origin due to the intransitive force of the verbal suffix *-inassus*. The verb *blōtan* was therefore most probably used not only in a transitive but also in an intransitive sense which constituted the bridge between *blōtan* and the *inōn*-verbs. The semantic element¹⁶ involved in this problem of verbal suffixes has not been sufficiently emphasized.

VII. Gothic *þragjan* "to run."

Grienberger (*ibid.*, 217) considers *þragjan* a denominative verb from a substantive **þraga-* or **þragō-*. This is of course possible (cf. OE **þrēgan* "to run" from *þræg* "lapse of time"). But there is another possibility which Grienberger has overlooked, viz. that the *j*-suffix is original.

If we connect *þrag-jan* with Grk. *τρέχω* : *τρέχ-ος*¹⁷ we must assume that the radical vowel *ǣ* in *þrag-jan* represents an IE *ō*. According to Brugmann¹⁸ the iterative-causative suffix *-ēie* : *-ēie-ti* was used with verbs containing the radical vowel IE *ō* (cf. Grk. *φέρω* : *φορέω*, Lat. *decet* : *docēo*) in which case the *j*-suffix in *þrag-jan* could be original just as, e. g., in *far-jan* (cf.

¹⁶ It will be noted that the verbal abstract *us-blōteins*, *παράκλησις*, "prayer, entreaty" is transitive in force. The *jan*-verbs (from which the *eini*-suffix is derived) were predominantly transitive. Therefore it is not necessary to postulate with Grienberger (*Untersuchungen zur got. Wortkunde*, 51) a verb **us-blōtjan*—Grienberger writes *uf-blōteins*, **uf-blōtjan*—(which would most probably be causative in force), for a verb **us-blōtan* could be transitive (*παράκαλέω*) "beseech." The transitive function of this verb could form the bridge connecting the verbal abstract with the *jan*-verbs, just as the intransitive function of *blōtan* (*λατρεύειν*) "to perform a religious ceremony" connected this verb with the *inōn*-class and hence with the verbal abstracts in *-inassus*. With *us-blōteins* compare *ga-skaideins* (*διαστολή*) "difference" : *ga-skaidan* [*sik*] trans.

¹⁷ Cf. Grienberger (*ibid.*) and Feist, *Etym. Wtb. der got. Sprache*, 278-9.

¹⁸ *Grundriss*, II, 3², 122.

Grk. *περάω* : *πέρ-ος*, *πορεύομαι*) and the weak conjugation of *þrag-jan* may be explained as due to the *j*-suffix just as in the case of *far-jan*.

It will be noted that whereas the durative intransitive verbs *ligan* "to lie," *sitan* "to sit" have entirely lost the original *j*-suffix, the iterative intransitive verbs of motion *farjan* (alongside *faran*) "to travel [by ship]" and *þragjan* "to run" have retained it. I believe that the retention of the *j*-suffix in the latter type is due to at least *two* causes; viz. (1) to association with the denominative *jan*-type (cf. *farjan* : ON *ferja*, *far* "ship"; *laistjan* "eine Spur (*laists*) verfolgen" > "folgen"; and perhaps also **gaggjan*, *gaggida* (L. 19, 12) "einen Gang (*gagg*) machen") and (2) to association with the intransitive usage of *jan*-verbs denoting motion of the type *waltjan* "to toss [of waves]," *ga-wandjan* (without *sik*) "to turn," etc.

If we may assume that these factors account for the retention of the *j*-suffix in *farjan* and *þragjan*, we may perhaps explain the retention of the *j*-suffix in *wahsjan* (over against ON *vaxa*, WGerm. **wahsan*) "to grow." It is possible that the *j*-suffix¹⁹ in *wahs-jan* was identified with the *j*-suffix of the type *farjan* : *þrag-jan* because of the semantic similarity between the two types, i. e., both types represented intransitive verbs denoting a *change*, one of *place*, the other of *condition* (cf. Goth. *wairþan* "to become" : Lat. *vertere* "to turn"; Eng. *turn* = *move around* : *turn gray* = *become gray*). The retention of the *j*-suffix in *wahs-jan* may then perhaps be due to the example of the intransitive verbs of motion of the type *far-jan* : *þrag-jan*. This seems all the more likely in that the durative intransitive verbs *sitan* "to sit" and *ligan* "to lie" have, on the other hand, entirely lost the *j*-suffix. However, there is the possibility that *wahs-jan* stood under the formal influence of the verbs of the seventh ablaut series with *j*-suffix in the present tense (cf. *hlah-jan*, *haf-jan*, *skap-jan*, etc.). But this possibility seems more remote when we consider that Goth. *wahs-jan* (with *j*-suffix)

¹⁹ The *j*-suffix in *wahs-jan* is generally explained as causative (*wahseip* = Sansk. *wakṣayati* "he causes to grow" < IE **uogs-éie-ti*); see Kieckers, *Handb. der got. Sprache*, 203, 219. But the original causative force of the suffix became iterative in conformity with the intransitive sense which the verb assumed in Germanic.

can hardly be separated from North²⁰ and West Germ. **wahsan* (without *j*-suffix). If the analogy in question obtained in Gothic, why did it not obtain in North and West Germ., where the *j*-suffix in the seventh ablaut series was likewise preserved (cf. Goth. *haf-jan* : ON *hefja*, OHG *heffen*; Goth. *skapjan* : ON *skepja*, OHG *skepfen*)?

At any rate, the semantic factors of this problem concerning the retention of an original *j*-suffix should be considered in conjunction with the purely phonetic aspects. The verb *pragjan*, if not denominative in origin, belongs to the type *farjan*. That the *j*-suffix in *wahsjan* was retained because of its meaning and thus identified with the *j*-suffix in the type *farjan* is not at all certain but at least possible. The example of the durative intransitive verbs *sitan* and *ligan* favors this hypothesis.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.

THE ISLANDS OF PEISISTRATOS.

One of the more confused passages in Pliny's geographical books (*Nat. Hist.*, V, 136-8) mentions the Islands of Peisistratos. Pliny is enumerating the islands off Asia, starting from Egypt (128, *insularum ante Asiam prima est in Canopico ostio Nili—Pharos*) and ending at the Hellespont (141). The main items are Cyprus (129), Rhodes (132), Samos (135), Chios (136), Lesbos (139). The general direction, we see, is northwards. He concludes his notice of Chios with the words: *posita est inter Samum et Lesbum, ex adverso maxime Erythrarum*. The next two sections I quote complete, from Mayhoff's text, whose punctuation only I modify:

(137) *Finitimae sunt Tellusa quam alii Daphnusam scribunt, Oenusa, Elaphitis, Euryanassa, Arginusa cum oppido—iam hae circa Ephesum—et quae Pisistrati vocantur Anthinae, Myon-*

²⁰ Cf. OSwed. *vaxa* : OIcel. *vaxa* (Noreen, *Aschw. Grm.*, § 540, Anm. 4). Kieckers (*ibid.*, 203) says of Goth. *wahsjan*: "Andere Sprachen weisen kein *j* auf."

nesos, Diarrheusa—in utraque oppida intercidere—Poroselene cum oppido, Cerciae, Halone, Commone, Illetia, Lepria, Aethre, Sphaeria, Proculusae, Bolbulae, Pheate, Priapos, Syce, Melane, Aenare, Sidusa, Pele, Drymusa, Anhydros, Scopelos, Sycusa, Marathusa, Psile, Perirrheusa, multaeque ignobiles, (138) clara vero in alto Teos cum oppido, a Chio LXXII D, tantundem ab Erythris: iuxta Zmyrnam sunt Peristerides, Carteria, Alopece, Elaeusa, Bacchina, Pystira, Crommyonnesos, Megale: ante Troada Ascaniae, Plateae tres, dein Lamiae, Plitaniae duae, Plate, Scopelos, Getone, Arthedon, Coele, Lagusae, Didymae.

Mayhoff puts a full stop before *iam hae circa Ephesum*, and so refers those four words to what follows instead of to what precedes: I do not think the words *iam hae* could bear that meaning. I have removed another full stop at the end of 137, before *clara vero*: those two words answer *ignobiles* and I mean my comma to allow for that.

Two corrections of names I offer at once: for *circa Ephesum* in § 136 read *circa Lesbum*, and for *Teos* in § 138 read *Tenedos*. These changes, if accepted, give a decidedly northerly bias, and the reader should not accept them till more of the argument has been developed. Provisionally I justify them (a) because Arginusa is near Lesbos, not near Ephesos, (b) because Teos is not an island and though Pliny sometimes mistakes a peninsula for an island, the emphatic *in alto* points very strongly to Tenedos, though the distances which follow are false.

The names which can be placed are: Oenusa, Arginusa, Poroselene, Sidusa, Pele, Drymusa, Marathusa, Teos or Tenedos, Carteria, Bacchina (?), Lagusae (?). Getone reappears in IV, 74 (Gethone, seemingly near the Chersonese). It is not necessary to equate Alopece with Alopeconnesos (IV, 74), nor Halone with the Propontis island of that name (V, 151); the latter might conceivably be equated with Halonnesos near Embata (Strabo, XIV, 1, 33) south of Erythrai, but since two Halonnesoi and one Halone are already distinguishable, it seems simplest to distinguish one more here. For Myonnesos, see below.

If we follow the known names, the first list of islands (§ 137) starts northwards from Chios city to Oinoussai, passes up east of Lesbos, past Arginousai to Poroselene, then comes south, past Sidousa (somewhere in Erythrean territory (Thuc., VIII, 24, 2; cf. Stephanos, s. vv. Σίδουσα and Σίδους) to Pele, Drymoussa, and Marathousa, all three in the Gulf of Smyrna, just north of

Klazomenai (Thuc., VIII, 31, 3). Neither Teos nor Tenedos is exactly in this route, but Tenedos seems to me a more intelligible footnote to it than Teos would be. Second list (§ 138), headed "*iuxta Zmyrnam*": of these names two (Karteria, Bakcheion) are near Phokaia (Thuc., VIII, 101, 2; Livy, XXXVII, 21), and Elaiousa is off Lebedos just south of Arginousai (Strabo, XIII, 1, 67); i. e., the list emerges from the Gulf of Smyrna and meets the list in 137. I think it probably goes up to the Hekatonnesoi (see below). Third list (§ 138), headed "*ante Troada*," begins, I believe, where the second leaves off. In this, if Lagousai is rightly equated with the small island north of Tenedos which Philippson (*Topographische Karte des westlichen Kleinasien*, Blatt 1) marks "Rabbit Island (Lagusae?)," then the absence of Tenedos is noteworthy; otherwise, one might think the list did not go north of Cape Lekton. I note finally that both Arginousai and Tenedos are given in 140, among the islands off Lesbos. This gives us a fourth list (Arginusae, Phellusa, Pedna, Tenedus) which crosses the first and third.

The reader should now consider the corrections: "*iam hae circa Lesbum*" and "*clara vero in alto Tenedos*," proposed above. None of the three lists goes south of Chios city, and the third ends up near the Hellespont. Neither Ephesos nor Teos is in the picture at all.

What then of the islands of Peisistratos? They come between Arginousai and Poroselene. If we look at the map, we see that they can hardly be other than the Ἑκατόννησοι opposite Aivalyk at the entry to the Adramyttian Gulf: Poroselene is one of them.

Strabo (quoted below) says of the Hekatonnesoi that they are 20 in number, or (as Timosthenes says) 40: they are called Hekatonnesoi not because there are 100 of them, but after Apollo = Hekatos. If, as seems possible, we have here a partial list of them, then Nesos, the largest of the group, must be mentioned. Nesos, known from coins, from a decree of the city of Nesos, from the Athenian Assessments, and from an archaic dedication in Athens, is never named in literature.¹ Never, that is, in the texts as we have them; but it must I believe be

¹ Coins in Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 563; the decree, *I. G.*, XII, 2, no. 645, = *O. G. I.*, 4; Assessments, *I. G.*, I², 64 (cf. Meritt and West, *The*

restored in Strabo certainly, and perhaps in "Skylax," and here. The curious name which looks like a common noun was likely to puzzle copyists.

Strabo, XIII, 2, 5: κατὰ δὲ τὸν πορθμὸν τὸν μεταξύ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Λέσβου νησία ἐστὶ περὶ εἴκοσιν (ὡς δὲ Τιμοσθένης φησί, τετταράκοντα), καλοῦνται δ' Ἑκατόννησοι—πλησίον δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ Πορδοσελήνη πόλιν ὁμώνυμον ἔχουσα ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ἄλλη νῆσος [πόλις] μείζων αὐτῆς <καὶ Νῆσος πόλις> ὁμώνυμος ἔρημος. The first πόλις must go, as all editors agree; on the other hand, ὁμώνυμος needs πόλις, and the conjunction νῆσος πόλις is too good to sacrifice altogether. Pliny (as I think we shall see) confirms this sense, the city of Nesos had perished by Roman times.

"Skylax" 97:² κατὰ δὲ ταύτην (sc. Λέσβον) νῆσός ἐστι καὶ πόλις, ὄνομα δὲ ταύτης <Νῆσος, καὶ> Πορδοσελήνη. The superfluous ὄνομα δὲ ταύτης would be very singular in "Skylax" unless there were some special reason, such as the use of a common noun as a proper name supplies. Alternatively, we might perhaps write κατὰ δὲ ταύτην Νῆσός ἐστι καὶ Πορδοσελήνη, and regard [πόλις ὄνομα δὲ ταύτης] as a gloss on Νῆσος.

Coming back to Pliny: it is possible they were called Peisistratos' islands, but we know that one explanation of their usual name was that they were Hekatos' islands, and I suspect we should understand *quae Hecati vocantur*, or something of that sense, however we may explain the corruption.³ One of the two islands whose cities have perished must be Nesos (cf. Strabo); we are left with *Anthinae myon* (and variants, see Mayhoff's apparatus) for the first name of all. It has been thought that Stephanos, s. v. Χάλκισ: ζ' νῆσος ἔχουσα πόλιν ὁμώνυμον πρὸς τῇ Λέσβῳ, may give the name of one of our group:

Athenian Assessment, p. 81); archaic dedication, *I. G.*, I², 547; "never in literature," see Schwahn, s. v. Nesiotai (1) in Pauly-Wissowa.

² I use the section numbers of *G. G. M.* (not those of the MSS and of Fabricius). I write "Skylax" as one might "Baedeker," "Debrett," "Webster." I take the periploous we have to be a many times re-edited version of the original Skylax.

³ I suspect that Pliny wrote *Pisistrati* and that the corruption goes back to a Greek source (Isidoros?): αἵ περ Ἑκάτον καλοῦνται could, not inconceivably, come out as αἱ Πεισιστράτου καλοῦνται. ΠΕΙΣΙΚ<ΤΡ>.

perhaps it hides in *Cerchia*. To make these considerations concrete:

Finitimae [*sc.* Chio] sunt: Thallusa;⁴ . . . Oenussae; Elaphitis, Euryanassa, Arginusa cum oppido (iam hae circa Ephesum); et ἀπὲρ Ἑκάτον νῆσοι καλοῦνται: Anthemion;⁵ Nesos, Diarrheusa (in utraque oppida intercideret); Poroselene cum oppido; Chalcis; Halone; Crommyonesos; . . . Sidusa; Pele . . . multaeque ignobiles, clara vero in alto Tenedos.⁶ . . . iuxta Zmyrnam sunt: Peristerides; Carteria; Alopece; Elaeusa; Bacchion; Pystira; Crommyonesos; Megale. ante Troada: Ascaniae . . .

I have restored Crommyonesos not only (as Mayhoff does) for Commynesos in 138, but also for Commone in 137. Crommyonesos: Crommyonesos. I take them to be the same island (as *Arginusae* in 140 are the same as *Euryanassa Arginusa* in 137). The "second list," headed *iuxta Zmyrnam*, passes Phokaia with *Carteria* and Lebedos with *Elaeussa*, and it is altogether likely that with *Crommyonesos Megale* it reaches the Hekatonnesoi: the "third list" then begins *ante Troada*. Crommyonesos is no doubt the island marked Krommydonisi on Philippon's map. (Megale is possibly Pordoselene: cf. Stephanos, *s. v.* Σελήνης πόλις.)

It is premature to speculate what this curiously convoluted course has to tell us about Pliny's method of contaminating his sources. A really geographical edition of his geographical books is wanted first; and that will not be easy to get. There are few more delicate tasks than reconstituting a geographer's text, where corruption is constant in the mass of proper names, but the restorer must always use the dangerous method of harmonization. And he must dare sometimes to correct not Pliny's text, but Pliny himself. I offer my suggestions above, not as a text,

⁴ MS *Thellusa* suggests Thallusa rather than Tellusa.

⁵ Anth[im]emyon. I am rather shy of suggesting "Anthine <Crommyon>(nesos) Nesos," making a third mention of Onion Island—or with Bolbulae a fourth!

⁶ The distances (a Chio $\overline{\text{LXXII}}$ D, tantundem ab Erythris) are utterly false for Tenedos, but not far out for Teos. I do not think Teos can have been meant originally (*sc.* by Pliny's original). But Pliny does not in fact mention Teos elsewhere in his geography; he may have excerpted the distances for use with Teos, and inserted them here; i. e., the error Te[ned]os occurred already in Pliny's own MS.

but as a basis for discussion. Perhaps I am proposing to obliterate precious evidence of Peisistratos' Sigeion wars, or his family's later sojourn under Persian rule.⁷

H. T. WADE-GERY.

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY.

B. G. U. II, 475.

A fresh interpretation of B. G. U. II, 475 (2nd cent. A. D.) has recently been proposed by Dr. Naphtali Lewis.¹ The papyrus is a report of rent obtained from the lessees of an estate formerly in private possession but now under the control of the imperial treasury. Dr. Lewis has given a useful recension² of the text, and I repeat it here for the reader's convenience.

συνήχθη ἐκ διαμισθωτικοῦ [πρό]τερον . . . α[. . .]

Ἀματίας, νυνὲ δὲ τοῦ ἱε[ρωτάτο]υ ταμε[ίο]υ ζ (ἔτους)·

ἔστι δὲ

ἀπὸ ἀργυρίου (τάλαντων) η (δραχμῶν) Ἄμβ ÷

5. μετὰ τὸ ἀποποιηθὲν ὑπὲρ τε τόπων

οικημάτων μεμενηκότων καὶ ἄλλων

δηλωθέντων εἶναι ἐν συμπτώσει καὶ

ἀμπελικῶν κτημάτων μεταδοθέντων

εἶναι ἐν τάξει αὐτουργουμένων ἐνίων μι-

10. σθωτῶν ὧν μὲν τετελευτηκότων ὧν δὲ

ἀνακεχωρηκότων ἀρ(γυρίου) (τάλαντον) α (δραχμὰς) Ἐρκγ ÷

λοιπὰ ἀργυρίου (τάλαντα) ζ (δραχμαὶ) Ἀθκς

ἐξ ὧν εἰσεπράχ[θη ὑ]πὲρ λημμάτων[ων]

τοῦ αὐτοῦ ζ (ἔτους) (τάλαντα) δ (δραχμαὶ) Ἐυνς =

For the first time since the text was originally published by

⁷No use has been made in the above of the evidence of the Attic Quota-lists. In them, Σιδούσιοι and Ἐλαιούσιοι both appear with the modifier Ἐρυθραίων, and should no doubt be identified with Pliny's Sidusa and Elaeusa. See the forthcoming *Athenian Tribute Lists* by Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, in the "Gazetteer," s. v. Ἐρυθραῖοι.

¹ *Classical Philology*, XXXIII (1938), pp. 98 f.

² The papyrus has substantially the same text on *recto* and *verso*.

Wilcken³ in 1885, Dr. Lewis has arrived at a clear and correct statement of the accounting of the report. In accepting ζ (ἔτους), the obvious reading of the papyrus in l. 2, he has eliminated the distortion introduced by (τάλαντα) ς, a reading projected by Rostovtseff⁴ in his discussion of the text. Although he makes no statement to that effect, Dr. Lewis's successful treatment of the arithmetic is dependent on his recognition of the fact that the sum which is expected at the end of l. 2 was not entered even after it was obtained in l. 14.⁵ ἔστι δέ, which constitutes the whole of l. 3, marks the beginning of the detailed account, and there is unavoidably, in the present state of the text, an anacoluthon between ll. 2 and 3.

The reasons, however, assigned in ll. 5-11 for the reduction of the rent from 8 tal. 4049 dr. 1 ob. to 7 tal. 1926 dr. need to be reëxamined. The property from which no return is expected is described in the following terms: (1) τόπων ἀοικήτων μεμενηκότων, (2) ἄλλων δηλωθέντων εἶναι ἐν συμπτώσει, and (3) ἀμπελικῶν κτημάτων μεταδοθέντων εἶναι ἐν τάξει αὐτουργομένων ἐνίων μισθωτῶν ὧν μὲν τετελεσθηκότων ὧν δὲ ἀνακεχωρηκότων. In (1) and (2) the participial phrase gives the reason why the property does not produce

³ Ulrich Wilcken, "Beitrag zur Kenntnis der roemischen Bodenverwaltung Aegyptens," *Études archéologiques, linguistiques et historiques, dédiées à Mr. le Dr. C. Leemans* (Leyden, 1885), pp. 67 f.

⁴ Michael Rostowzew, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, Beiheft 1, Leipzig and Berlin, 1910), p. 188.

⁵ The method of bookkeeping is illustrated by P. Tebt. I, 89 (113 B. C.), where the total recorded in l. 8 checks with the total recorded in l. 32. Similarly, in P. Tebt. II, 339 (224 A. D.), the words γ (ἵκονται) αἰ π (ποκείμεναι) in l. 16 refer to the amount recorded in l. 11. (Both texts may be consulted in A. S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri II* ["Loeb Classical Library," Cambridge and London, 1934], Nos. 398 and 400.) Cf. P. Mich. III, 200 (181-180 B. C.), 17, note. For the contribution of Ptolemaic policy to this type of accounting see W. L. Westermann, "Hadrian's Decree on Renting State Domain in Egypt," *J. E. A.*, XI (1925), pp. 166 f. Its influence continues to be felt in the accounting methods of the sixth and seventh centuries A. D.; cf. E. R. Hardy, Jr., *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt* (New York, 1931), pp. 100 f.; Michael Schnebel, "An Agricultural Ledger in P. Bad. 95," *J. E. A.*, XIV (1928), pp. 34 ff. A detailed technical study of the papyrus accounts is very much needed to clarify the relation between government accounting and that used on the private estates on the one hand, and between these and ordinary private bookkeeping on the other.

rent. With regard to (3), Dr. Lewis is quite right in feeling that μεταδοθέντων requires εἶναι κτλ. to complete it,⁶ but in making a unit of αὐτουργομένων . . . ἀνακεχωρηκότων, dependent on τάξει, and understanding the words to mean "in the roster of certain lessee-cultivators some of whom have died and others fled," he misses the point.⁷ Both Wilcken⁸ and Preisigke⁹ recognize that ἐν τάξει αὐτουργομένων is a complete phrase. Expressions of this type are regularly used to indicate classes of persons¹⁰ or of land.¹¹ Since vineyards are in question, ἐν τάξει αὐτουργομένων marks the category of land to which they belong.¹² Once this fact is established, the category can be readily identified. On this point Preisigke is of no real help since he restricts his translation to the bare meaning of the words.¹³ The explanation offered by Wilcken¹⁴ in 1885 is not tenable in the light of present knowledge. It is not credible that neighboring peasants could have exploited abandoned vineyards to their own profit without making the due payments to the treasury, especially if their activity were so well known to officials as to be mentioned in a report of rent. Rostovtseff has understood completely the bearing of the phrase, but his statement gives no

⁶ The same construction was placed on these words by Preisigke; cf. note 9.

⁷ Apart from the Berlin papyrus, Preisigke (*Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, s. v. αὐτουργέω) lists 13 occurrences of the word, among which there is no example of the middle.

⁸ Wilcken, *op. cit.*, 67, places a comma after αὐτουργομένων.

⁹ Preisigke, *op. cit.*, s. v. τάξις 5, c, cites ἀμπελικά κτήματα μεταδοθέντα εἶναι ἐν τάξει αὐτουργομένων, which he explains as follows: "die Weingärten stehen laut Bericht in den Listen verbucht als selbständig bewirtschaftete Grundstücke."

¹⁰ E. g., P. Mich. III, 172, 15 ἐν τῇ τῶν μαθητῶν τάξει; cf. Preisigke, *op. cit.*, s. v. τάξις 5.

¹¹ E. g., the well-known ἐν κατοικικῇ τάξει; cf. Preisigke, *ibid.*

¹² This relation is clearly recognized in Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, new edition, s. v. αὐτουργέω, where B. G. U. II, 475 is cited for κτήματα αὐτουργούμενα. Cf. note 9, above.

¹³ Cf. note 9.

¹⁴ Wilcken, *op. cit.*, 68: "Einige der kaiserlichen Pächter waren in diesem Jahre gestorben, andere hatten sich ihren drückenden Verpflichtungen durch die Flucht entzogen, die kaiserlichen Weingärten den Bauern preisgebend, die nun darüber herfielen und zu ihrem eigenen Gewinn den Boden auszunutzen suchten." Wilcken's interpretation has doubtless altered considerably in the years since 1885.

clue to the exact construction of *αὐτουργουμένων*. In commenting on the papyrus,¹⁵ he remarks: "Es scheint auch, dass die Pächter alle direct vom Staate gepachtet haben ohne Afterpächter." The *ἀμπελικὰ κτήματα* belonged in that category of land which was cultivated by *οὐσιακοὶ γεωργοί* or *μισθωταί*¹⁶ without the privilege of sublease.¹⁷ The following genitive absolute *ἐνίων . . . ἀνακεχωρηκότων* accounts for the failure of the vineyards to yield rent.

Dr. Lewis has rejected Preisigke's translation¹⁸ of *τόπων ἀοικήτων μεμενηκότων* as "unbewohnt gebliebene Zimmer" in favor of the view taken by Wilcken,¹⁹ who, under the influence of Strabo, xvii, 786, thought of the *τόποι* as "die unbewohnt gebliebenen 'Landstriche,' i. e., 'die höher gelegenen, vom Nil in diesem Jahre nicht befruchteten Felder.'" A study of the usage of *ἐν συμπτώσει*, which occurs in l. 7, does not support this conclusion. If from the examples listed by Preisigke in his *Wörterbuch*, s. v. *σύμπτωσις*, we exclude those that refer to bodily degeneration, the objects stated to be *ἐν συμπτώσει* are the following: *οἰκία*, *θύρα*, *λάκκος*, *ὑδροδοχεῖον*, *ληνῶν σὺν πίθῳ*, *ψιλὸς τόπος*,²⁰ *οἰκόπεδον*.²¹ These comprise houses, parts of houses, cisterns, wine-presses, and building-sites, but not arable land.²² For the last, Greek relies on *χέρσος* and its compounds.²³ Ancient usage, therefore, supports the conclusion that *τόπος* in

¹⁵ Rostowzew, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

¹⁶ It is evident from the context that the *μισθωταί* of the Berlin papyrus are not "Grosspächter"; cf. Rostowzew, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

¹⁷ Ulrich Wilcken, *Grundzüge der Papyruskunde* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1912), pp. 292, 299 f.

¹⁸ Preisigke, *op. cit.*, s. v. *ἀοίκητος*; cf. *τόπος* l, i: "unbewohnt gebliebene Wohnräume."

¹⁹ Wilcken, *Études Leemans*, p. 68.

²⁰ Preisigke, *op. cit.*, s. v. *τόπος* l, h: "Grundstück mit einem verfallenen, unbrauchbaren Hause, oder ein für Hausbarzwecke bestimmtes Grundstück, welches zur Zeit noch unverwendet daliegt."

²¹ *οἰκόπεδον* is either a building-site or the building standing on it; cf. Liddell and Scott, *op. cit.*, s. v.; P. Mich. III, 188, 9-10, note.

²² The same situation is found to obtain in the passages cited by Preisigke, *op. cit.*, s. v. *συνπίπτω*, *-πτώσιμος*; Liddell and Scott, *op. cit.*, s. v. *συνπίπτω*, *-πτωμα*, *-πτωσις*.

²³ Michael Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft im Hellenistischen Ägypten* (*Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung u. antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, Heft 7, Munich, 1925), pp. 9 ff.; for definition of *χέρσος* see pp. 19-20.

this text is an object comparable with οἰκία, θύρα, etc. The word is attested in the sense of "room," but τόπος is as vague as English "place" and in the present instance may be thought of as "dwelling-place," whether room or house. The tenants on an estate needed living-quarters, and for these they doubtless paid rent. ἀοίκητος is then acceptable in its literal signification of "unoccupied." Certain dwellings have remained unoccupied and others have collapsed.

These considerations justify the following translation of the long prepositional phrase that extends over ll. 5-11: "on account of dwellings which have remained unoccupied; others which have been shown to have collapsed; and tracts of vineyard, reported to be in the category of land cultivated by lessees without privilege of sublease, of which a certain number of lessees have died and others have fled."

H. C. YOUTIE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

DE ATTIO ET PRAXIDICO: PLIN., N. H., XVIII, 200.

Satis constat turbas aliquando motas esse loco Plinii N. H., XVIII, 200. Ibi enim inter ea quae e *Geoponicis* profert ieiuna praecepta post locum Catonis, quem enotaverat quemque aliquo loco inculcare volebat, de satione inseruit haec: *adiexit his Attius in Praxidico, ut sereretur cum luna esset in ariete, g-minis, leone, libra, aquario; Zoroastres sole scorpionis duodecim partes transgresso, cum luna esset in tauro.* In indice autem Plinius haec: (ex) *Attio qui Praxidica scripsit.*

Attium non esse Accium et in verbis, ut ea exhibui, nihil mutandum esse post Crusii et Wilamowitzii notas constat (cf. Teuffel, § 134, 12). Didicimus enim ex codicibus astrologorum graecorum Praxidicum fuisse mathematicum. Duobus enim quod sciam locis ibi Praxidici nomen occurrit: in *Catalogo Codicum Astrolog. Graec.*, I, 97, tractatus Τιμαίου Πραξίδου (sic) περὶ δραπετῶν καὶ κλεπτῶν, *ibid.*, V, 3, 87 alter Ζωροάστρων κατὰ Πραξίδικον περὶ πολέμων προσδοκωμένον publici iuris factus est. Hae inscriptiones quomodo interpretandae sint dubites; certe Timaeus (quem saeculo fere primo a. Chr. n. fuisse posui [*R.-E.*, s. v.]), se Praxidico usum esse dicere potuit, Zoroaster se ex Praxidico

haurire dicere non potuit, sive hoc verum hominis nomen fuit sive ficticiū et a Πραξιδίκαις derivatum (qua in re commemorandum est Praxidicam inter decanorum nomina apud Cosmam apparere: W. Gundel, *Dekane und Dekansternbilder*, 73 et 354). At qui caput illud excerpsit fortasse dicere voluit Praxidicum Zoroastris auctoritate uti.

Utut res se habet, Attium nihil fecisse puto nisi Praxidicum vertisse; et quoniam Persius (1, 50) *Iliadem* ieiunam Attii Labeonis perstringit (cuius genus Sabinum fuisse titulis probatur; cf. Bücheler, *Kl. Schrift.*, III, 17 et 384), hunc eundem fuisse suspiceris qui etiam Praxidicum [poetam, ut opinor] transtulit. Quod si recte se habet, in iis scriptoribus recentibus est, quos Plinius opere fere absoluto evoluit excerptaque eis inseruit quae ex fontibus primariis transcripserat. Mathematicos autem curasse quam vim stellae in re rustica haberent cognosces ex egregio Heegii de Orphei ἔργους libello (München, 1907); cf. *Orphei fragm.* 280-283, Kern.

Restat alia observatio. Et apud Plinium et in tractatu illo de bello Praxidicus et Zoroaster simul adferuntur: sumas igitur Attium diversae Soroastris opinionis mentionem iniecissee. Quod tamen minus verisimile videtur; neque enim est mathematicorum contrarias sententias adferre, et si vere poeta fuit Attius ut suspicatus sum, certe id non fecit. Quod si verum est, Plinius in fine § 200 duo excerpta adnexuit, alterum ex ipso Attio petitum, alterum ut opinor apud Bolium inventum, quem Zoroastreis usum esse Wellmann (*Abh. Akad. Berl.*, 1928, 14) probavit.

W. KROLL.

BERLIN, GRUNEWALD.

REVIEWS.

A. VON PREMIERSTEIN(†); ed. Hans Volkmann. Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats. (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Abteilung, n. F., Heft 15.) München, Beck, 1937. Pp. xii + 290.

The most significant contribution to the study of the principate which has appeared in connection with the Augustan bimillennium is almost certainly this posthumous work by von Premierstein. If his death deprived the book of much which he might have added and of his final judgment on many points, the editor, Prof. Volkmann, with the aid of Prof. Otto, has skillfully welded into a coördinate whole material left in varying degrees of preparation and he has supplemented von Premierstein's rich documentation with references to literature which has appeared since 1935. The result without doubt presents von Premierstein's interpretation of the principate as he himself would have wished it to appear. The publication by the Munich Academy leaves nothing to be desired for accuracy and dignity.

The book falls into three main sections. The first, on the philosophic basis of the principate, constitutes only a fragment of what would have been a very profound appreciation of the ideas which motivated Augustus. von Premierstein on the whole discounts the influence of Greek thought, especially as transmitted to Rome through the Middle Stoa, i. e. Panaetius, and through Cicero. The four virtues inscribed on the shield of honor bestowed upon Augustus in 27 B. C. (*Res Gestae*, ed. Gagé, ch. 34, 2) are more Roman than Stoic and are perhaps connected with the presentation of Augustus as a second Romulus which is also reflected in Dionysius' account of the founder of Rome. The present tendency in most fields of Roman studies is to emphasize the native elements at the expense of foreign influences. In certain fields, such as art, this tendency antedates contemporary efforts to establish "pure" nationalistic cultures. Nevertheless it is tempting to see in it a similar blindness to the impossibility of local exclusiveness in the intellectual, if not in the political and economic, realm. Scholars, however, who, like von Premierstein, explain the principate in terms of purely Roman ideology or, like Martino (*Lo Stato di Augusto*, p. 4), think that Augustus was too busy with the practical needs of the situation to pay much attention to theories, neglect a very important factor in any change of political structures. Although the precise form of such change must usually be adapted to the previously existing institutions and to the traditional prejudices of the people whom it affects, nevertheless the general plan or concept which exists in

the minds of those responsible for the innovations cannot help but be influenced by the intellectual atmosphere in which they have been educated. Buchan is hardly justified in saying of Augustus (*Augustus*, American edition, p. 168): "he was no philhellene, as indeed were few of the governing Romans." Juvenal's gibe about the *Graeculus esuriens* has often been taken as representative of the attitude of all Romans towards all Greeks, but from the time of the Scipionic Circle outstanding Greeks had been regarded as honored guests and friends of noble Roman families. In view of the importance of Greek philosophy in Roman education during the last century of the Republic and the admiration which the Romans felt for Greek culture, it is as absurd to deny that Augustus was familiar with Greek political theory as well as with Roman traditions and practices as to hold that because the framers of the American Constitution based their governmental machinery on English precedents, they were not at the same time conscious of the democratic ideals of the French liberals. Specifically, it is probable that the story of Romulus largely grew out of a desire to create for Rome the dignity of a founder-legend like those of Greek city states, and that the picture of him as the ideal ruler originated in the same moralizing interpretation of mythology which the Stoics applied to Heracles. Moreover, though von Premerstein (p. 7) holds that Augustus chose as a means to his end not the philosophic ethic familiar only to a narrow circle but a national and religious revival of Romanism which would appeal to the masses, Cicero had already sought to adapt Greek theory to Roman practice and it would be difficult to show that Augustus as a young man had not known Cicero's writings or views, which, their author shows, circulated fairly immediately and widely among thoughtful people at Rome. Though Oltramare himself ("La réaction Cicéronienne, etc.," *Rev. des Études Lat.*, X [1932], p. 90) minimizes the direct effect of Cicero's writings on Augustus and emphasizes rather their popularity in the reactionary circle at Rome which Augustus sought to win over by his constitutional program, yet his remark (p. 59) about Cicero's relation to his Greek models might partially apply to Augustus: "Ce sont les expériences et les opinions personnelles de Cicéron qui donnent une couleur originale à ce tableau politique dont le dessin est inspiré par la pensée hellénique."

The second and much fuller section on the sociological basis of the principate presents von Premerstein's alternative, and Roman, explanation of its ideological background. By a penetrating analysis of the use made in the later Republic of the patron-client relation for political purposes he seeks to show that Augustus became the patron *par excellence* not only of the Roman populace but of the provinces and, because clients had often been called upon to serve in private armies during the last

century of the Republic, of the troops as well. The political struggles of the declining Republic had witnessed the introduction into the client's relation to his patron of an oath by which he bound himself to regard the interest of his patron and of his patron's family as paramount to his own. From this oath, von Premerstein derives the *coniuratio Italiae* of 32 B. C. (*RG.*, 25, 2) and the oath thereafter taken to the emperor. This latter oath, von Premerstein holds (pp. 60-61), did not become annual until the reign of Gaius. He distinguishes between this oath of loyalty as taken by the troops and their regular oath of service, and he maintains that by the oath of loyalty they were brought into a personal relation with the emperor. Because the oath was taken before the legionary shrine, in which, among the standards, stood a statue of the emperor, it helped in the development of the worship of the living emperor. Furthermore, von Premerstein indicates that the oath as taken in the west had a more purely Roman, and hence cliental, character than that taken in the east, where it was influenced by the traditions of Hellenistic monarchism. Almost immediately, however, the oath, which had at first been at least outwardly a voluntary "devotion" of oneself to the leader, became throughout the empire a required test of loyalty to the ruler. Despite von Premerstein's penetrating analysis of patronage and of the oath, it is hard to accept his contention (p. 16) that the *principes* of the later Republic were the great patrons. A patron stood in a well-defined relation to a specific group of clients, upon whom, in return for his protection, he could call for services and support. The position of a *princeps*, especially in Cicero's eyes, seems to have been much less precise. A *princeps* was a person whose status, character, and abilities so commanded the respect of the whole population that they would follow his lead not from a sense of obligation but of respect. The emperor, to be sure, assumed responsibility for the well-being of the Roman populace, of the provincials, and of the army; and in consequence the importance of the patronage of the other noble families declined. But no ancient author or source actually interprets his position as a *patrocinium*. Possibly the emperor's care for the population of Rome, especially the free grain distribution, the *congiaria*, and the bequests, originated in Caesar's desire, as democratic leader, to act as patron to the mob. Yet free grain had been distributed by the state under the Republic; and the mob continued to seek out private patrons during the Empire, though presumably a client should confine himself to one patron. Hence it is perhaps more likely that beginning with the Gracchi there had developed, under the influence of Greek ideas, the feeling that the state had an obligation to care for its citizens and that one who was prominent in the state should, even out of his own resources, meet this responsibility.

From the position of the *princeps* as supreme patron, von Premierstein develops his third section on the constitutional basis of the principate. The tribunician power and the proconsular *imperium* do not, as is well known, cover all the spheres in which the sources indicate that Augustus acted independently. Moreover, they were bound up with republican traditions and limitations. von Premierstein therefore concludes that there was a third, more comprehensive, element in the principate, the *cura legum et morum*. This was first granted in 27 B. C. (Dio, LIII, 12, 1; Strabo, XVII, p. 840 C) by a decree of the senate, whose sweeping terminology is reflected in the "discretionary clause" of the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani*. Upon this grant depended the *auctoritas* of which Augustus himself speaks (*RG.*, 34, 3)—an *auctoritas* no longer formless, like that of the republican *principes*, but specific, like that of the senate, and, because derived from the senate, parallel to the *senatus auctoritas* in its universal scope. The *cura legum et morum* justified Augustus' reform of the city of Rome and his censorial acts. In virtue of the *cura*, he was like a father overseeing the family; he was *pater patriae*. From the *auctoritas* involved in the *cura* stemmed his extraordinary jurisdiction, his licensing of jurisconsults, his interference in senatorial provinces and free cities, often through the agency of his "friends," and similar activities.

After this sweeping solution of the problems connected with the exercise of the *imperium*, von Premierstein can interpret the *imperium* itself conservatively. He denies the existence of any vague *imperium* or of any general *imperium consulare* and admits only a military *imperium proconsulare maius*. The name *imperator* did not indicate the holder of a supreme *imperium*, but was a republican title adopted by Caesar as hereditary for his monarchical position. As such it was taken by Augustus about 38 B. C., but upon the surrender of his monarchical powers in 27 B. C. it was confirmed as a personal distinction by the senate. It was ordinarily not assumed by his immediate successors without authorization and it became a hereditary designation of the ruler only after Nero. In one respect only is von Premierstein's concept of the *imperium* novel; he concludes that in 23 B. C. Augustus assumed it for life and that he renewed only the *cura legum et morum* periodically. Thus von Premierstein harmonizes the accounts in Dio (LIII, 16, 2; 32, 5).

Opposed to his view of the *cura* stands Augustus' own statement (*RG.*, 6, Greek) that when it was offered to him he received no office contrary to ancestral customs. Von Premierstein applies this not to the *cura* itself, the acceptance of which is asserted by Dio (LIV, 10, 5; 30, 1) and Suetonius (*Aug.*, 27, 5), but to the exaggerated and dictatorial form in which it was offered. This plausible harmonizing of the contradiction meets with several objections. Augustus' denial follows exactly the form which he

uses (*RG.*, 5) for the dictatorship and the annual and perpetual consulship save that since the offer of the *cura* is expressed by a clause, the words "no office contrary to ancestral custom" are introduced as object of the main verb. Moreover the dates of the offers which Augustus gives, 19, 18, and 11 B. C., correspond only roughly to Dio's 19 and 12 B. C. and neither set falls readily into the five or ten year periods of renewal of the imperial power. von Premerstein (p. 152) emphasizes the fact that Suetonius, who is held to have used the *Res Gestae* directly (Gagé, *RG.*, pp. 39-40), specifically states (27, 5) that Augustus assumed the *cura* and in virtue of it conducted his censuses of 29 and 8, B. C. and 14 A. D. He explains Augustus' own statement (*RG.*, 8) that he conducted these either as consul (*censoria potestate*, *Fast. Ven.*) or *consulari cum imperio* as applying to the rites connected with the closing of the *lustrum*, for which he revived these republican powers. But Augustus' words sound polemical in both this instance and that of the *cura*. Possibly he was attempting to conceal his irregular powers; but in general the *Res Gestae* do not misstate fact, however much they are colored by suppression and selection. Dio goes on to say that he did take a censorship for five years and a consulship for life, both of which von Premerstein himself (pp. 160-162, 230), faced by Augustus' denials, admits to be at least exaggerations, perhaps of some special privileges connected with these offices which he did accept. It may equally be that Dio's "proconsular power once for all" in 23 B. C. (LIII, 33, 5) represents a similar exaggeration of the privilege of retaining it within the pomerium and that, therefore, the periodic renewals which Dio mentions under 27 B. C. (LIII, 12, 2) refer not to the *cura*, but as the context suggests, to the grant of the provinces and hence to the proconsular *imperium*. It is equally possible that neither Suetonius nor Dio was following the *Res Gestae* directly but some literary account based on the senatorial records. This would explain the similarity of phraseology and at the same time, if only the original votes and not Augustus' refusal of the powers figured in the records, would account for the discrepancy. In fact, it might even be argued that Augustus' own polemic was directed against similar misrepresentations of his position which were already circulating in his later years. At least, Tacitus (*Ann.*, I, 9-10) presents as topics of common talk at his death conflicting versions of his position and actions.

With regard to the tribunician power, von Premerstein deals rather drastically with Dio's accounts of three separate grants (36 B. C., XLIX, 15, 5; 30 B. C., LI, 19, 6; 23 B. C., LIII, 32, 5) by arguing that a full grant was made in 36, with an extension of the *ius auxilii* to the first milestone in 30, but that Augustus surrendered the power in 27 as unrepugnant. In 23, however, to implement the reforms which he was undertaking in virtue

of the *cura legum et morum*, he again assumed an annual tribunician power extending throughout the empire. About the inherent probability of such a view, as against the usual one that Dio inaccurately preserves a record of a steady extension of privileges first granted in 36, each must decide for himself. Modern historians no longer dismiss Dio as late and therefore worthless and von Premerstein (pp. 152-154, and especially p. 193) ardently champions his value. But even he cannot accept Dio's accuracy on all points. Thus it becomes a matter of judgment whether Dio, or, in fact, any authority, is to be accepted in the face of other evidence. To say that Dio was misled by his sources or that he misunderstood them or even that he interpreted them in the light of the development of the Empire is not wholly to disown him. If, with von Premerstein (p. 109), the Restored Republic be regarded as a fiction, then the *Res Gestae* and other contemporary material may be discounted in favor of later writers who saw through this fiction into the monarchical essence of the principate. If, however, some credence be given to the sincerity of Augustus' program, then the contemporary evidence must be weighed more heavily than that of subsequent historians, who present a picture colored by changes which the principate underwent.

In a concluding chapter, von Premerstein argues that Augustus sought to base the hereditary character of his position upon the hereditary relation of patron to client. This explains the importance which he attached to family relationship in the selection of his colleagues, the significance of *Caesar* as a family name, and the value to a possible successor of designation in the will as heir of the emperor's private property. At the same time it makes possible the outward fiction of the selection of a successor by the senate and people. Against this view, however, it may be argued that the importance of heredity is not confined to Rome or to the relation of client and patron. It is dubious how far the Greek east, or the still unromanized provinces of the west, or even the army or the mixed population of Rome would have comprehended such a relationship, especially in respect to a ruler. Certainly the group which showed the strongest loyalty to the house of the Caesars was not the fickle Roman mob, or even the legions, but the eastern provincials, in whom the tradition of monarchy was strong, and the German body-guard, with their great sense of personal devotion to their chieftains.

Though von Premerstein's general thesis may stir doubts like those expressed above, his points are argued with such depth of scholarship, acuteness of interpretation, and power of imagination that this book must be read, marked, and inwardly digested by all those who are concerned with the principate. Augustus himself, one sometimes feels, might smile tolerantly at scholars' efforts to define his position by rule and line and might say that

yes, he had sought to restore the Republic, but after all, there was this and that to be done, and the senate was hard to move, and people looked to him to do it. Nevertheless, any attempt to reconstruct from the scattered surviving ruins the fabric of a government which brought unity and peace to a torn world must command respectful attention in these troubled times. This study, with its insight into Roman mentality, its broad knowledge of the material, and its lucid presentation forms a worthy memorial of its author.

MASON HAMMOND.

AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME.

PIERRE BOYANCÉ. *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs: Études d'histoire et de psychologie religieuses.* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fascicule 141.) Paris, Boccard, 1937. Pp. 375.

Nothing more fallacious has appeared in recent times than the tendency to ignore the religious objectives of the Greek philosophers, to look in them only for material of the sort congenial to modern philosophical ways of thought: nothing more fallacious, perhaps, than the modern historical timidity which dates all anonymous philosophical material as late as possible, and then tries to reconstruct the history of ideas on the framework of such chronology, assuming that the ideas in a document must be as late as the latest date for its composition. But perhaps one thing has been still more misleading, the tendency to treat the history of religion as a record of myths and cult practices without an attempt to reconstruct the religious experiences of men of the past—what these cults and myths, or philosophical doctrines, meant to the persons who practised or believed them.

Through these basic fallacies the work of Boyancé cuts with telling sureness. The primary line of his investigation is to find the reason for the cult of the Muses among the Greek philosophers, and with it to show the meaning of Orpheus the musician. In works on Orphism Orpheus the musician is largely neglected. Actually there is a singular disagreement on this point between the literary evidence and the monuments. In the former there seems, at first, little to explain the fact that Orpheus in figured representations is universally one who charms beasts and men with his lyre. This Boyancé investigates, and turns up a surprising body of literary evidence to explain it. In brief, his thesis is that Pythagoras had at the outset two things: first, Dionysiac magical dance and music to conjure from men's bodies the evil spirits of disease and depression, and secondly, a magical use of number for similar ends. Pythagorean philosophy really

began with the discovery of the tetractys and the presence of a law of number in music. Now the two magical implements could be united and together become the subject of philosophic and scientific investigation. Without ceasing to use songs for religious purification in Pythagorean *θίασοι*, they found the truest music in the contemplation of the law of number as it presented itself in the abstract, in nature, and in the cosmic number-music of the spheres. Philosophy was music, and, as such, philosophy was the mystic catharsis *par excellence*.

The Orphics Boyancé tends to regard as a bastard branch of this movement, with Orpheus the musician as the real center of the cult. It was a descendant in that it kept some of the higher ideology of music and ethics from the Pythagoreans, but was of bar sinister in that it presented itself chiefly as a catharsis by incantation, though much more refined than the Dionysiac original. On this point the evidence is suggestive but not, to my mind, conclusive. The exact relation of Pythagoreans and Orphics is still an open question. Similarly his discussion of the influence of Orphism upon the Eleusinian mystery seems to me inconclusive.

The chief contribution of the Pythagoreans, in Boyancé's opinion, was, together with their treatment of music and number, their refining of the idea of catharsis from being a magical exorcism of demons in man to a conception more ethical and mystical. The demons may still cause illness or wickedness, but catharsis is a purification of states of one's own soul or body, not an expulsion of alien spirits. In this elevation of Greek thought to the ethical and mystical the gods were not abandoned: rather by the invention of allegorical interpretation of Homer and other sacred poetry the old incantations could be used to new effect. Sung at the ceremonial banquets of the Pythagorean *θίασοι*, and especially in *articula mortis*, these chants promised the Pythagorean unique hope in that next world which itself had been changed from the obscurity of Hades to the luminosity of the sun and moon. To support all of this the active appeal by Pythagoreans to the Muses and Apollo as the patron deities is used with great skill.

The second part of the study discusses the evidence for the myths and festivals in Plato and Aristotle. Boyancé shows that the purpose of the myth in Plato was to appeal to the "child within each man," and to educate that child which reason could not touch and which must be won to higher things, like all children, by fancy and incantation-music. For the myth is basically music, which is only transposed when it is rationalized into what was for Plato as for the Pythagoreans the higher or purer music, the philosophy of number. So in Boyancé's discussion I have understood for the first time the peculiarly difficult detail which Plato gives to the regulation of drinking,

music, and religious festivals for his ideal city in the *Laws*, as well as the dedication of that city to Apollo, Dionysus, and the Muses. The regulations are strikingly appropriate with the background of Pythagoreanism which Boyancé has gone far toward proving, and which he is right in saying we should have had to assume if the evidence he brings forward did not exist. He faces squarely the obvious fact that the Plato of the *Laws* is keenly interested in regulating religious cults on the ground that they themselves, when properly executed, are the *sine qua non* of a successful city. Boyancé is fully justified in saying that students of Plato's religion have been so interested in his ethics and doctrine of God that they have omitted this aspect almost entirely. For to Plato, it is clear, properly organized cults, with chants, dances, and wine, were an indispensable part of the philosophic discipline at which the organization of the city, and of the Academy, aimed.

Purgation in Aristotle's use of the term is still basically akin to the Pythagorean and Platonic mystic idea. It is the introduction of order into the soul and its passions by exposing the soul to the order of music or dramatic art. It releases the passions to put them in order. With Aristotle this is not based upon the earlier antithesis of soul and body, for the psychic belongs to the physical, and hence psychic catharsis is akin to physical or mechanical purgation. But in Aristotle's terms, as in those of the Pythagoreans, the soul is put into its highest state when it is harmonized with the order of the universe. The school which succeeded Aristotle continued this idea. It did not, any more than the Pythagoreans or Platonists, reject the established cults. Like them it rejected bloody sacrifice, but taught in general the connection of inner discipline with cult acts, while it definitely recognized the religious value of music when properly used. For late Peripatetic views of festivals, Boyancé relies chiefly on Strabo and Philo. Whether these reflect Peripatetic or Pythagorean inspiration seems to me still doubtful. (Boyancé is certainly correct in rejecting the traditional reference of these to Posidonius!) One wonders why he uses so little of Philo for his purpose. It is clear that Philo's explanation of Judaism is based precisely upon this mystic idea of philosophy as a saving force; for to him also external acts of ritual (in his case Jewish rites) are disciplines, when rightly understood and practised, leading to the true mystery of philosophy, since philosophy, for him as for Plato and the Pythagoreans, was ultimately an experience rather than an intellectual concept.

The third part of the study treats in detail an aspect of the subject frequently touched upon before, the matter of the organization of the philosophic schools into religious *θιασμοί*.

First in Pythagoreanism Boyancé traces a tradition back as far as Aristotle himself that that sect in Italy gave honors to

Pythagoras as the incarnate Apollo and as the representative of Demeter and the Muses. The connection with Demeter he explains as a sign of Pythagoras' power in the future life, since Demeter was the chief goddess in Magna Graecia for the fate of the soul after death. So, with this cult in the sect, Pythagoreanism contributed a synthesis between the traditional idea of the hero, which was mythical and social, and the new idea, mystical and moral.

In the discussion of the question whether the Academy was a religious *θίασος* it is shown that very early, perhaps during Plato's life, his pupils set up an altar to him. The author also argues, with excellent evidence, that the Academy was a real *θίασος* of the Muses, in which philosophy was the perfect music because it was the perfect elucidation of number, and hence was the perfect catharsis. Ceremonial banquets were a regular part of the meetings of the Academy in the sense of the Pythagorean and other mystical banquets. After Plato's death this practice was developed by the true heroization of Plato, the belief that he was the son of Apollo, the erection of a statue to him along with the Muses, and the observance of funeral banquets and eulogies as part of the Academic *θίασος*. The evidence for these latter points is late, but is very ably handled. What is even more striking is the impressive evidence assembled that the Peripatetics and Epicureans had a similar organization, similar views of the nature of their founder, and similar conceptions of the purpose of their philosophy.

It has seemed best to use this review to present the thesis of the author rather than to dispute details. That there are a good many pages which did not convince has been indicated clearly enough. But the work as a whole is so novel, not to say revolutionary, in its ideas, and at the same time is so closely studied and documented, that what is of primary importance is that it be widely read; for its general exposition of the religious content and objective of the Greek philosophers seems to me unassailable.

ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

J. D. DENNISTON. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp. lxxxii + 600.

In the age of classical scholarship which preceded our own, questions to be answered concerned words and their transmission to us in the texts. Now the questions are wider: about the full meaning of the great works of antiquity; and more minute as well: about quite tiny things—wisps of thought held momentarily

together in a poet's mind, and those grains of words, the Greek particles. Mr. Denniston's book on them is in the best tradition of to-day. It is like a great coral-reef, massive at first sight, but built of the most delicate precisions of intuitive art, combined by myriad toil.

Mr. Denniston's book is already known widely, alike for its accuracy and completeness and for the sensitivity and force with which alone nearly six hundred meanings of particles and combinations of particles could have been explained and classified. The 682 pages, representing the sustained effort of many years, required the collection and minute examination of 25,000 references.

The plan of the book is this: After a few pages of Preface and "Aid to the Reader" comes a long and elaborate Table of Contents, occupying twenty-five pages. Here the particles, their combinations, and the uses of them are listed. The Table of Contents serves, therefore, the purpose of an index—an excellent solution of a difficult problem, for an index of the usual kind would have lengthened the book to two volumes, perhaps adding hundreds of pages, with no advantage over the expedient actually adopted. Next follows a long Introduction, itself almost a book on the Greek particles, in which the nature and history of the particles and their usage by different authors are indicated. Then comes the Text. Last of all there is a Bibliography, preceded by "Addenda and Corrigenda" which ends with the words "Πολλά γ' ἡμᾶς λανθάνει"—rather like Scaliger's "Utinam essem bonus grammaticus!"

The method used in compiling the text is empirical and inductive. After all the occurrences of a particle or combination are collected (but not, of course, printed), the meanings, as the contexts prove them to be, are determined and classified. This method requires immense work; but it is the most, and indeed, for the simple particles, the only scientific method possible. Full explanations of the meanings are printed and for all of them plentiful examples are furnished.

The results are progressive and sometimes surprising. It is proved that there is only one *ἄρα* in Thucydides and that Plato postpones *ἄρα* far more often than the poets; that *ἄρα μή* positively does not expect a negative answer, is never used by the orators, and is, in fact, an exceedingly rare combination; that the orators never use *ἄτε*; that *δ' ἀλλά* is always followed by an imperative; that the essential force of *γε* is concentration, whereas limitation (the restrictive use, with a meaning of "at least") and also intensification are secondary (here Mr. Denniston distinguishes three different meanings of the italics in "He is a *good* man," all adequately to be rendered by *γε*; and brilliantly explains that "*γε* shuts itself up in the house, while

μέν, even when it is termed 'solitary,' looks at a neighbour, real or imaginary, over the garden wall"); that Euripides' habit of using δὴ with verbs goes beyond ordinary Greek practice; that the "self-contained *quidvis* ('anything') is regularly ὅτιοῦν, not ὅτι δὴ," though "self-contained ὅστισδὴποτε is frequent"; that "unlike γε but like μὴν . . . δὴ does develop into a full-blown connection," and connective δὴ gains ground rapidly in the fourth century until in Demosthenes the connective sense is far the commonest; that οὐκοῦν invariably has an interrogative tinge; and that τοίγαρ belongs wholly to the grand style. Much that is proved will confirm the intuitions of reasonably good scholars who have a sense of particles but who have hitherto had to hope that their intuition could be trusted. Much the larger part of the intricate facts of detail, however, lies beyond the reach of intuition.

For combinations of particles the inductive method is not so obviously the only eligible method as it is for simple particles. A deductive method, by which the meanings of the combinations are deduced from the inductively established meanings of the simple particles combined, also offers prospects of success, but at some risk of subjectivity of judgment. Mr. Denniston adheres to the inductive method, one advantage of which is that he does not have to postulate long ellipses, and thus can use the space saved for exact definitions of minutely distinguished meanings (cf. e. g. p. 264, "Δῆθεν . . . (1) After final conjunctions, implying, like δὴ, that the desired object is undesirable or contemptible, or not genuinely desired . . . (7) Expressing, not incredulity, but contempt or indignation: 'forsooth'"). Another advantage is that the risk of depending on theories of the origin of particles and combinations, which are often uncertain, is avoided; Mr. Denniston refers to the possible derivations, but does not usually rely on them.

I think, however, that sub-classification might sometimes have been saved and multiplicity reduced to unity by checking the inductively reached results by the deductive method. For example, p. 108 on καὶ γάρ and καὶ . . . γάρ Mr. Denniston says, "I. Normally γάρ is the connective, and καί means either (1) 'also' or 'even': or (2) 'in fact': or (3) 'both,' being answered by another καί." Later, however, on p. 109 he continues, "II. But sometimes, in answers, καί is the connective, and καὶ γάρ means 'yes, and,' or 'and further.'" The deductive method would, I think, have insisted on retaining "for" for γάρ, not reducing it to pure "yes," "further," or similar meanings. Aesch., *Ag.*, 1256: καὶ μὴν ἄγαν γ' "Ἑλλήν' ἐπίσταμαι φάτιν.— καὶ γὰρ τὰ πνθόκραντα· δυσμαθῇ δ' ὁμῶς would then have been, not " . . . Aye, and so are Pytho's oracles <spoken in Greek>," but something like "For (γάρ) in fact (καί), <as an example

and proof that I (Cassandra) know Greek, and incidentally as a new consideration at the present moment, > those oracles from Pytho . . .” Eur., *Phaedr.*, 611: ὦ πάτερ, κλύεις ἂ πάσχω;—καὶ γὰρ οἷα δρᾷς κλύει would have been, not “ . . . Yes, and besides . . .,” but “<Yes, probably he does,> for in fact . . .” That is, if one, why not the other? Though οἷα δρᾷς κλύει is said formally as a reason why κλύεις may well be true, by implication it adds something in contrast. Eur., *I. A.*, 641: ὦ πάτερ, ἐσεῖδον σ’ ἀσμένῃ πολλῷ χρόνῳ.—καὶ γὰρ πατήρ σέ would have been, not “Yes, and your father is glad to see you too,” but “<Naturally—as obviously the feelings would be reciprocal—,> for in fact your father is glad . . . <so that we can all guess how glad you are>.” That is, he expresses a natural desire to say how glad he is, in addition to saying that he can well believe that she is glad. As before, a new thing is said under cover of a reason advanced for something said already. An alternative here would be to say that γάρ affects καί only, and that the meaning is, “<You certainly are glad and *that* is true,> for (γάρ) it is quite apart from that (καί) that your father is glad. . . .” That is, “Your father knows that he is not the only one pleased”; he uses this form to insist that he is pleased also. So also p. 113, Mr. Denniston says that for one classification of καὶ γάρ τοι “the notion of consequence is almost always appropriate. . . . Isoc., V, 108, ‘Philip the Great knew how to treat Hellenes and barbarians. καὶ γάρ τοι συνέβη διὰ τὸ γνῶναι περὶ τούτων αὐτὸν ἰδίως καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν γεγενῆσθαι πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξηλλαγμένην.’” Here “and in consequence . . .” is clearly enough the virtual meaning, and to the empirical, inductive method it is the intrinsic meaning also. But the deductive method would take that to be a secondary meaning, the primary meaning being “Philip knew . . . ; for (γάρ) in fact (καί), as you remember or ought to remember (τοι), <not only *did* he know, but> the *result* of his knowledge <and a *fortiori* his knowledge itself> is a real fact, that his kingdom . . .” Other combinations might perhaps be explained on a similar principle. But how much trust should be given to each of the two methods is a question which no one is so well qualified to decide as Mr. Denniston himself.

The effect of Mr. Denniston’s interpretation of the particles reaches far beyond them. The knowledge gained proves that the *P. V.* is late, not early, and almost certainly the work of Aeschylus himself at the end of his life (a result confirmed by a metrical analysis by Mr. Denniston himself, and also by another by Mr. E. Harrison, not to mention an analysis of the ideas of the *P. V.* by myself). The particles also help to date many of Plato’s dialogues. Readings wrongly suspected or approved through ignorance of particles are enabled again and

again to be corrected (for example, when repetitions of the same particle, now shown not to have offended the Greeks, are concerned; and in many passages where questions have been raised about γε, οὐκουν, οὐκοῦν). One of the most important decisions is the new certainty that when Arist., *Poet.*, 1453 b 28 says καθάπερ καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐποίησεν, the meaning "also" is quite misleading, since "καί" refers not to the content of the main clause, but to other, unspecified examples"—a final solution of an old problem.

I have only one adverse criticism. The text of the book is carefully organized in sections, sub-sections, and further subdivisions internal to them. But unless the reader remembers the figures and letters used to designate them, and looks very carefully, he will not realize to which classification a paragraph belongs. The only escape from this would have been either by more pages, and so two volumes, not one, or by a larger format, which would allow wider and varied margins. This larger format I should have preferred.

There are, however, likely to be few, if any, greater works of scholarship in our generation.

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE SOUTH WEST,
EXETER, ENGLAND.

TH. REINACH AND A. PUECH. *Alcée, Sapho. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection des Universités de France, l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Paris, "Les Belles Lettres," 1937.

The preface and the introductions to the two parts (pp. v, 23, 184 ff.) indicate the history of this edition. We learn that Théodore Reinach had undertaken the edition and worked on it for many years, but had not yet completed it when death overtook him. He had not even been able to make full use of the editions by Lobel (published in 1925 and 1927), which have laid an entirely new foundation especially for the papyrus material. M. Puech has prepared the work for publication; he had the assistance of M. Julien Reinach, son of Théodore Reinach, in arranging the leaflets of the original manuscript. M. Puech professes extreme piety in dealing with the posthumous work of so eminent a Hellenist, and he has been careful to keep his own contributions apart from Th. Reinach's legacy.¹

The result of this procedure, however, as it appears from some sampling, is rather disconcerting.

¹ A. Meillet, who had promised to revise the texts from the linguistic point of view, was also prevented by death from completing his share of the task, which was then taken over by M. Chantraine.

Alcaeus frag. 123 Diehl (= no. 10 Lobel) is presented in the following various shapes:

(1) under no. 45 the text of the papyrus is reprinted from the editio princeps, with only a (false) restoration transferred from Hunt's notes to the text. The critical notes quote the results of Lobel's revision.

(2) under no. 45a the same text is reprinted from Lobel. The difference is indeed considerable in that now Lobel's better readings appear not in the notes but in the text, and three previously known fragments, which had been identified as being in part extant on the papyrus, are incorporated. An additional note from the hand of M. Puech discusses the fragment and translates what can be translated.

(3) under no. 131a the same text is reprinted from Lobel a second time, with critical notes and with a new translation by M. Puech.

(4, 5, 6) The three previously known fragments, which had twice (45a and 131a) been exhibited embodied in the text to which they had been shown to belong, are again edited each by itself. One is listed as no. 131 so that it precedes the comprehensive edition 131a, but the two others are set apart and bear the numbers 134 and 135. Under no. 135 the critical notes already given under 131a are repeated but not in identical wording. On nos. 134 and 135 the reader is referred to no. 131a, but not vice versa. In the notes on no. 45a the two fragments edited in this book as nos. 131 and 134 are quoted as nos. 59 and 97 Bergk; the third (98 Bergk = 135 Reinach) is here forgotten and no authority mentioned for it.

It seems obvious that loose leaflets have been published much as they were found among the papers of Th. Reinach and some of them brought to a kind of completeness with little respect to the others.²

On Alcaeus frag. 123 (= 55 Lobel = 35 Diehl) we find the remark: "Textum a Diels restitutum ap. Diehl qui—sicut Lobel—hoc fragmentum cum nostro 124 coniunxit." The facts hidden in this cryptic statement are these: (1) Frag. 123, which was edited for the first time by Reinach himself, was soon recognised as belonging to the same poem as frag. 124. Diels (in 1920) restored the two fragments with admirable ingenuity and skill, but as less than half of every line is extant his restoration is largely imaginative. (2) Diehl, in his edition of 1923, followed Diels. These two facts are of little interest today, and the new edition is right in not reprinting the restoration of Diels.

² A similar mistake (viz. frag. 142 Diehl edited twice as nos. 23 and 90) is attributed by M. Puech, in a note on frag. 90, to "une hésitation de M. Reinach." No. 23 makes the fragment a hymn to Poverty, no. 90 a poem on poverty.

But relevant is the following: (3) Lobel (in 1927) showed that the assumed gap between the two parts of the poem does not exist. The first line of 124 and the last but one line of 123 combine into one line, and the two papyrus pieces join here. The edition under review takes no account of this. It still not only lists the continuous sections of the poem under two numbers but also severs the two continuous parts of the same line. It is true that in the critical note on the one part of the line (123, 17) Lobel's reading of the combined parts is quoted, but with no indication that the other part is identical with 124, 1 and taken from there. And then again we read in a note by M. Puech: "Il y a quelque vraisemblance que le fragment doit, comme le pense Lobel, être réuni au précédent auquel il est métriquement analogue."

In working on his redaction of the text, his translation and notes for Sappho frag. 93 (= 96 Diehl = pp. 42 and 79 Lobel), Th. Reinach apparently overlooked an addendum in Lobel's edition. Lobel had succeeded in fitting in a new piece of papyrus and had thus enriched the text by a considerable number of words. True to his principle, M. Puech prints everything as prepared for publication by Th. Reinach, and it is only through an affixed note that he gives information of the valuable additional evidence, leaving it thus to the reader to adjust the preceding text, translation and critical notes to the new material and to discard restorations refuted by it.³ Presumably many readers will be less anxious for a conscientious edition of Th. Reinach's papers than a practical presentation of the evidence on Alcaeus' and Sappho's poetry.

Recent literature on the subject has been entirely disregarded. Advantage has not been taken even of such a good and convenient tool as the second edition of Diehl's *Anthologia lyrica*, published in 1935 and covering approximately the same ground. Only the first edition is cited.⁴ The passages quoted from other authors have not been revised according to more recent editions. Omissions, misstatements, inconsistencies and misprints abound; clarity and precision are often missing.

I have confined myself to discussing the treatment of simple facts in this edition, because this is the basic question and no appreciable progress can be made unless minimum requirements in that respect are met. But I take pleasure in emphasizing that the lay-out of the edition, especially in the Sappho part, is sound

³ Nevertheless, the rediscovery of Lobel's addendum to no. 93 (Reinach) has not led the editor to investigate further and find two other substantial addenda to nos. 56 and 96 (Reinach), printed by Lobel on the preceding and following pages respectively (pp. 78 and 80). Thus the rich new material which the addenda offer is missing from the text of fragments 56 and 96 (= 55 and 98 Diehl = pp. 20 and 45 Lobel).

⁴ Occasionally, however, the siglum "Diehl" (with no.) covers not the *Anthologia Lyrica* of 1923 but the *Supplementum Lyricum* of 1917.

and circumspect, and that M. Puech has succeeded in correcting several of Th. Reinach's misinterpretations. Furthermore, the cooperation of MM. Meillet and Chantraine is evident in the deletion of objectionable word-forms.

It certainly is no enviable task to revise and finish a work begun by someone else. Yet one cannot but regret that the uncompleted and entirely antiquated notes left by Théodore Reinach have not either been discarded or brought into a shape fit for publication, and that the fragments of Sappho's and Alcaeus' poems have not found a more adequate presentation in the Collection des Universités de France which includes editions like that of the *Bellum Gallicum* by the late L.-A. Constans.

HERMANN FRÄNKEL.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

LOUIS ROBERT. Collection Froehner: I, Inscriptions Grecques. Paris, 1936. Pp. ix + 160 with 51 plates.

At the suggestion of M. Jean Babelon, Robert has undertaken to publish the collection of Greek inscriptions left by Wilhelm Froehner to the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale. This admirable and very welcome volume is the result. It is not the sort of undertaking that Robert would have set for himself, for the Froehner collection is a most miscellaneous assortment, much of it of only mediocre quality, and it is well known that Robert is a strong advocate of the study of related documents. The life of the epigraphist would indeed be a happy one if he could study always only those documents in which he is most interested. The appearance of this volume shows that Robert does not hesitate to undertake a task that should be done, even though it leads him away from Hellenistic epigraphy, particularly that of Asia Minor, to which he has devoted most of his attention.

Even so, the documents in this book are handled with extraordinary skill and dispatch, which one has come to expect of Robert, though they range over the whole ancient world from Egypt to Sicily. As might be expected, he is at his best in Karia, and the chapter on Theangela is perhaps the high point of the volume. For the present reviewer, it is marred only by an unnecessary display of personal feeling (cf. especially p. 66). The mistakes of one less well informed can always be effectively corrected without resort to general condemnation.

It is perhaps natural that a reviewer should seek out from such a collection as this those documents that lie closest to his own field of interest, so I append here a few notes which bear more particularly on the Athenian inscriptions in Froehner's collection.

No. 1. The reading is given by Robert as [h]αγνονίδες ἀνέθεκε τὰ θεναίαι. A glance at the photograph (Plate X) shows that if this reading is correct a space of one letter must be assumed between ἀνέθεκε and τὰ θεναίαι. Unfortunately the photograph is so unsatisfactory that one cannot be sure whether this space was or was not inscribed. This is probably the fault of the bronze rather than of the photographer, but nevertheless the uncertainty exists. It has seemed to me that traces of nu are visible, but these would have to be verified on the original in Paris before being claimed as certain. In the collection of dedicatory inscriptions on bronze from the Acropolis at Athens published in the *Corpus* (*I. G.*, I², 401-462) the form ἀνέθεκεν is far more frequent than ἀνέθεκε, occurring almost invariably where considerations of meter in a metrical text do not demand the shorter form. The same is true of the dedications on stone (*I. G.*, I², 463-837). In the present text one expects the normal form ἀνέθεκεν, and I suggest the reading ἀνέθεκεν with no uninscribed space left between the last two words of the dedication. In spite of Robert's text, I believe that the photograph supports this interpretation.

No. 2. Photographs of this fragment of a naval catalogue are now published also by D. M. Robinson in *A. J. A.*, XLI (1937), p. 295.

No. 3. The skeleton restorations which Robert proposes for this Athenian decree involve contradictions that render his exact form impossible. Robert notes, and his Plate III shows clearly, that the inscription was stoichedon. Granting the longest possible tribal name (Ἄ[καμαντίδος]) and the longest possible ordinal numeral (δωδεκάτης) to line 2, the maximum number of letters may be 35. Since line 3 was of the same length, only 8 letters are left for the date by month and the date by prytany. One or the other of these dates must be omitted; for reasons of space alone they cannot both be supplied. If both are supplied, then there is no possible restoration for line 2, and the difficulties are enormously increased for lines 4 and 5. The enigmatic letters ΜΗΔΕΙΑ --, for which Robert offers no explanation, must be part of a proper name, the patronymic of the chairman of the board of proedroi; his name appeared at the end of line 4 and his demotic in the middle of line 5. No restoration of line 3 should be so long as to render the restoration of these names impossible.

One may observe that the preamble of the decree is unusual in that it omits mention of the secretary. This is a fact of considerable significance, which Robert has not attempted to value. In view also of the character of the lettering (fourth century) and the phrase τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν *nomen*, *nomen*

patris, demoticum, καὶ συμπρόεδροι, this absence of the secretary's name makes almost obligatory a date between 318/7 and 308/7 B. C. This new inscription from the Froehner collection is, in fact, valuable additional evidence that in this period the omission of the secretary's name was the normal rule and not the exception. No secretary is mentioned in *I. G.*, II², 449, 450, 451, and 453 (318/7, 314/3, 313/2, and 310/09 B. C.). I owe to a communication from Dow the suggestion that *I. G.*, II², 454 should be restored with a stoichedon line of 38 letters and the archon's name ἐφ' Ἡγησίου (324/3 B. C.); this document can no longer be cited for the secretary of 308/7 B. C. Also, I think it now evident that *I. G.*, II², 452 (which names a secretary from Hagnous) should be assigned to the year 328/7 B. C. with the archon's name restored [ἐπὶ Εὐθυκρί]του in line 1. The full name of the secretary was Πυθόδηλος Πυθοδήλου Ἀγνούσιος (cf. *I. G.*, II², 354), to be restored in *I. G.*, II², 452, possibly with one uninscribed letter space at the end of line 2. Robert's new fragment is part of the cumulative proof that the secretary was not named in the preamble of Athenian decrees during the régime of Demetrios of Phaleron.

The two decrees now assigned to the year of Euthykritos define more exactly its calendar character. The year was intercalary (cf. Dinsmoor, *Archons*, pp. 371 and 429) beginning with hollow Hekatombaion. The first three prytanies had 39 days each and the next four had 38 days each. *I. G.*, II², 452 was passed on the 222nd day of the year: [ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδ]ος ἑκτῆς πρυτανείας ἢ Πυθόδηλος Πυθοδήλ]ου Ἀγνούσιος [ἐ]γγρ[αμμάτευεν· Γαμηλιώνος ἕκτ]ει ἐπὶ δέκα, [ἐ]νάτε[ι καὶ εἰκοστεί τῆς πρυτανείας]. (The new reading of the date is clear on the squeeze.) *I. G.*, II², 354 was passed on the 295th day of the year: ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντισχίδος ὀγ[δόης πρυτανείας] ἢ Πυθόδηλος Πυθοδήλου [Ἀγνούσιος ἐγγρ]αμμάτευεν· ἔνθι καὶ νείαι, ἕ[κτθι καὶ εἰκοστ]ῇ τῆς πρυτανείας.

No. 5. Robert's restoration of this small epitaph fails to take account of those physical considerations of the stone which the epigraphist cannot disregard with impunity. The symmetrical arrangement of the inscription above the sculptured relief (see Plate III) shows that the name Λαν[δίκη?], as Robert has restored it, would extend so far to the right that the figure of the man in the relief would become the central figure of the composition. Such an arrangement is inconceivable; the correct proportion is given by the restoration Ξάνθου [γυνή] in line 3, which posits just enough stone to allow a balanced composition in the relief below. The median line of the inscription must fall approximately on the second rho in Μυρρ — of line 2. It is thus evident that the reading Λαν[δίκη?] cannot be correct, and indeed Robert could not have proposed it if he had exam-

ined the stone with his usual care. The initial gamma of the name has left its trace in the first letter space of line 1, so that (with due regard to the width of the stele) the name may be read as Γλαν[κίς]. The second line should be read Μυρρ[-³⁻⁴], and I suggest no restoration. The third line is correctly shown in Robert's text.

No. 34. The text as given by Robert reads—ἀνέ]θεκε Δι Κρονίονι ΕΔ ΜΔ. The final letters, for which Robert can offer no explanation, depend upon a false reading of the inscription. If one may judge from the photograph published in Plate XXXII, the letters visible are actually FANA, and the restoration of course should be φάνα[κτι]. The phrase occurs frequently in hexameter verse. Wernicke's belief that the line forms part of a metrical inscription is thus confirmed (*Röm. Mitt.*, IV, 1889, p. 171), though not with the division he proposes between hexameter and pentameter lines. The exact parallel is found in an inscription discovered at Nemea in 1926 and first published by Blegen in *A. J. A.*, XXXI (1927), p. 433 (see also Peek, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1931, p. 103): Ἀρίστis με ἀνέθεκε Δι Κρονίονι φάνακτι. The fragment here published belongs to the end of a hexameter verse, from which the name of the dedicator has been lost. Froehner's belief that the bronze was found at Olympia was denied by Furtwängler, who gave the provenance as Epidauros. In view of the close parallel with the other inscription from Nemea, I suggest that no. 34 was also a dedication to the Nemean Zeus, and the "Epidaurian" provenance is thus easily explained.

No. 39. "Le graveur a écrit un N au lieu d'un H." This observation is erroneous (see Plate XVI), and the eta in ἀνέθηκε may be read without parentheses. From the single dot between the uprights of the letter, one cannot define the slope or direction of the transverse line.

No. 44. The Amphipolitans named here are not included in the Amphipolitan prosopography given by Papastavru, *Amphipolis*, pp. 59-146. The list there should be augmented by reference to this inscription.

In an appendix Robert gives a catalogue of the inscriptions in the Cabinet des Médailles not in the Froehner collection and not transferred to the Louvre when most such stones were moved in 1918. The list is small: nos. 92-97 only, and I do not believe that it is complete. Robert makes no mention, for example, of the Paris fragment of *I. G.*, I², 256-257. The stone contains part of the records of the treasurers of Athena of objects preserved in the Hekatompedon in 434/3 and 433/2 B. C. It belonged to the collection of the Duc de Luynes (no.

820) and I made a squeeze and transcript of it in the Cabinet des Médailles in 1925. Whether it is there now I do not know, but I suspect that Robert would have found it if his search had been thorough. There is little to add to the text as published in the *Corpus*. I note merely $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ for $[\delta]\acute{\epsilon}$ in line 2, $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ for $\tau[ο]ύ\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in line 4, $\text{'Αθελαια}[s]$ for $[\text{'Α}]θελαια[s]$ in line 8, and $\text{'Αν}[αφλ]ύσ[τι]ος$ for $\text{'Αν}[αφλ]ύσ[τιο]s$ in line 8. Of more importance for the disposition of the inscription is the fact that an uninscribed space of one line (not shown in *I. G.*, I², 256) was left between the lines now numbered 5 and 6.

Robert lists as no. 92 another fragment of the Hekatompedon records, also from the collection of the Duc de Luynes (no. 821), and publishes a photograph of one face of the stone on Plate XLVIII. The inscription deserves a better photograph, and one would welcome also a good photograph of the other face, which contains parts of the records of three years (*I. G.*, I², 264, 265, and 266). Robert has paid no attention to this side of the stone. From my squeeze I note by line the following readings: 55, $[\epsilon]\kappa$ and $\Pi\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha[ια]$; 56, $[\Pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta]ίας \Sigma\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\omicron \Phi[εγα -]$; 57, $\epsilon\rho[αμ]μάτε[νε]$; 58, $[\eta\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron]μ\acute{\pi}\acute{\epsilon}\delta[οι]$ and $\sigma[τα\thetaμ]όν$; 60, $[\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha]λ[αι] \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\alpha[ι]$; 63, $[\Pi]\rho\epsilon\sigmaβία -$; 64, $[\sigma\tau\alpha\theta]μόν \tau -$; 75, $[\epsilon\pi\epsilon]γένε[το]$; 76, $[\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau]ες ΗΔΓ[τττ]$; 80, $[\eta\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron]μ\acute{\pi}\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\iota$; 81, $[\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\thetaμ]ος \acute{\alpha}[\pi\omicron\rho\rho\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu]$; 82, $[\hbar\delta]ν \hbar[\epsilon \text{ Νίκε}]$; 83, $[\sigma]τα[θμ]όν$; 84, $[\tau\omicron]ύ\tau\omicron$; 85, $[\sigma\tau]έφ[ανος]$; 86, $[\sigma\tau\alpha]θμ[όν]$.

From the reverse face (*I. G.*, I², 268, 269, and 270) I note also the following readings: 101, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\acute{\iota} \hbar\alpha[ι]$; 102, $\hbar\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}$; 103, $-ε\acute{\upsilon}s$ and $\hbar\omicron\acute{\iota}s$; 104, $\text{'Ανα}\chi\omicron\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota$; 105, $-π\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\mu}\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon\nu$; 106, $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\theta[μ\omicron\varsigma]$; 107, $-σ\delta \text{ I}[ι]$ and $\chi\rho[υ\sigma\acute{o}s]$; 108, $\kappa\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\omicron[ν]$; 110, $\text{I}[ι]\text{I}[ι] \text{I}[ι] \sigma[τα\thetaμ]όν$; 114, $\chi\rho[υ\sigma\acute{o}s]$; 115, $-[\sigma]ύ\tau\omicron \Delta\Delta\Delta\Gamma$; 116, $[\hbar\omicron]ι \tau\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$; 117, $\text{E}\acute{\theta}[\chi]σ\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$; 121, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\rho[α]ν\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}[\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\acute{o}]ν$; 122, $\text{N}[\acute{\iota}\kappa]ε$; 125, $\text{I}[ι] \text{I}[ι] ΗΔΔΔ\Gamma \text{I}[ι]$; 127, $\Delta\Delta\Gamma[τ \text{I}[ι]]$; 128, $\chi[\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{o}s]$; 133, $\Pi\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu \epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\mu}\alpha\tau\epsilon[νε]$; 134, $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ and $\hbar[ο\acute{\iota}s] \text{E}[\acute{\theta}\chi\sigma\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma]$; 135, $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma[α\acute{\iota}]$; 138, $\sigma\tau\alpha\thetaμ\acute{o}\nu \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron \text{H}[\text{H}]$; 140, $\text{H}[\Delta\Delta\Delta\Gamma \text{I}[ι]]$.

No. 93. This is almost certainly a list of the prytaneis of Kekropis (cf. *I. G.*, II², 1743) and is evidence for the representation of the deme Sypalettos in the fourth century B. C.

The book is well manufactured by the Bontemps Press at Limoges, and contains a minimum of printer's errors. One should perhaps note that C. Vanderpool (p. 7) should be E. Vanderpool, that $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\upsilon\gamma[\chi\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota]$ (twice) on p. 28 should be $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\upsilon\gamma[\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota]$, that *Cyzikus* on p. 61 should be *Cyzicus* as elsewhere correctly quoted, and that the prytany list on Plate III is no. 93 and not no. 92. But these are minor matters. Robert has produced a very learned publication of the strange assortment of inscriptions gathered by Wilhelm Froehner, made easily useful by its photographs and its full indexes. The

Bibliothèque Nationale is to be congratulated on having secured so competent an epigraphist for a task which must have entailed considerable sacrifice.

B. D. MERITT.

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY.

MARTIN GRABMANN. Mittelalterliche Deutung und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre vom ΝΟΥΣ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΟΣ nach einer Zusammenstellung im Cod. B III 22 der Universitätsbibliothek Basel. (*Sitzb. der Bayer. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt.*, 1936, Heft 4.) Munich, Beck, 1936. Pp. 106.

The last 18 pages of this monograph contain the text of an anonymous *quaestio* which is preserved in a codex first noted by P. Germain Morin in 1927 and described by P. Raymond Martin in 1930. The *quaestio* is formally: *Utrum beatitudo consistat in intellectu agente, supposito quod consistat in intellectu?* The tractate is in reality, however, a collection of 16 theories concerning the active intelligence,—the opinions represented being those of Plato, *quidam theologizantes*, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Avicenna, Averroës, Themistius (2), John Philoponus, Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines, James of Viterbo, Durand, an anonymous interpreter, Dietrich of Freiburg (2), and Thomas Aquinas. Since it is the opinion of Thomas which the author adopts, he was apparently a Dominican; the space given to consideration of Dietrich inclines Grabmann to the belief that he was a German. The tractate was apparently composed between 1308 and 1323 (Thomas is called "frater Thomas," not "sanctus Thomas").

The first section of the monograph is a free translation of the tractate with the addition, after the translation of each opinion and criticism, of some remarks indicating the source and characteristics of the opinion considered. The middle section (pp. 53-84) is designed to place the tractate in its proper position in the history of philosophy; here the author discusses the connection of the tractate with other scholastic treatments of the active intelligence, the concern of the 13th and 14th centuries with the interpretation of the Aristotelian theory of the νοῦς ποιητικός, and the attitude of the *quaestio* toward German mysticism as indicated by its extensive consideration and rejection of the doctrine of Dietrich.

The monograph is a worthy addition to the long series of the author's contributions to the history of mediaeval thought.

HAROLD CHERNISS.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

J. SVENNUNG. *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre.* Uppsala, Lundequist, 1936. Pp. 71. Kr. 2.25.

This slender volume comprises four careful studies in the field of late Latin. In Chapter I is traced the history of consonantized *i*, as in *medius*. Sometimes *i* fuses with a preceding consonant, which is then assibilated or palatalized. Sometimes it disappears and leaves no trace. One example of the loss of *i*, by dissimilation, *aes cyprum*, occurs (p. 23) in Vitruvius, VII, 11, 1 (p. 167, 3 Krohn). Svennung argues, against Romance philologists, that the omission of *i* after *r* in the Italian dialects, as in *gennaro* (Tuscan *gennaio*), is a survival from vulgar Latin (pp. 25-27).

Chapter II traces the history of *oi* in Greek loan words in Latin. In Chapter III examples are given, from late Latin, of the interchange of *g* and *u* before *or*, rarely, after a back vowel; and parallels are cited from Germanic languages and Russian. Svennung points out (pp. 44-45) that the occurrence of such changes in late Latin renders unnecessary Grandgent's explanation of those which appear in Italian and Roumanian—e. g., Italian *ugola* < Latin *uvula*—by the assumption of an improbable kind of "confusion between two sets of endings, as a point of departure" (p. 41).

In Chapter IV the author, fully aware that a mistake in copying may easily be misinterpreted as an indication of phonetic change, lists a large number of *possible* examples of the phonetic phenomenon of "dittology." Nearly all of these examples are derived from inscriptions.

While Svennung's indices of subjects and of words are adequate, his index of passages is far from complete. The following misprints have been noted: "acutarus" for "actuarus" (p. 20); "qu'on à affaire" for "qu'on a affaire" (p. 26); "Beispinle" for "Beispiele" (p. 46); "ober" for "oben" (p. 50).

ALICE F. BRAUNLICH.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

W. STETTNER. *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, XXII). Stuttgart-Berlin, W. Kohlhammer, 1934. Pp. viii + 92.

In three chapters Stettner outlines the ancient theories concerning the migration of the soul, classified according to Cumont's division of the subject (p. 44, 4): those of the Pythagoreans, Pindar, Empedocles, and Plato (pp. 7-41), of the Hellenistic and Roman centuries (pp. 42-66), finally those from the

second century A. D. until the end of antiquity (pp. 67-88). As an introduction, he gives a collection of passages in which the words *μετεμψύχωσις*, *μετεμψυχοῦσθαι*, *μετενσωμάτωσις*, *μετενσωματοῦσθαι*, *παλιγγενεσία*, *μεταγγισμός*, *μεταγγίζειν* occur (pp. 5-6). This material is a very valuable addition to the lexicographical comprehension of the terms in question which have been so strangely neglected (cf. H. St. Jones in Liddell-Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford, 1925, Preface, p. ix). From the evidence which Stettner was able to gather it seems to follow that, contrary to Rohde's contention, *μετεμψύχωσις* was the most common expression for the migration of the soul (pp. 3-4).

Stettner says that his study is only the beginning of an inquiry into a subject to which no adequate attention has been given (p. 1). This statement is astonishing in view of the books of Rohde and Cumont. Yet Stettner, in disagreement with both these writers, holds it necessary to isolate his problem. One would think that the doctrines regarding the migration of the soul cannot properly be understood except in connection with the belief regarding immortality as such. The way in which Stettner proceeds accounts for the fact that his short study of such a difficult question is less instructive as an interpretation of the various theories than it is as a survey of the dispersed statements; I doubt that this method can ever produce a satisfactory solution of the problem.

Among other passages there are two in which Stettner proposes solutions that seem to me unacceptable. Herodotus' report of those Greeks who believed in the migration of the soul (II, 123) is considered by him to be evidence for the Pythagorean doctrine, since Pindar, Empedocles, and Plato espoused different dogmas (p. 9). But the conception of the *κύκλος τῆς γενέσεως* which, as Stettner himself points out, is decisive in Herodotus' description, is also Orphic (cf. Kern, fr. II, 229-230). The statement, therefore, may be a reference to the Orphics as well, a possibility which Stettner does not take into account. Following the latest theories of Wilamowitz, he postpones any discussion of the Orphic theories until the end of his book and goes so far as to state that the Orphic literature is for the most part nothing but the transformation of Platonic myths (p. 87). His argumentation in this case is not cogent. Next, Stettner again adopts the deletion of Vergil, *Aeneid* VI, 745-747 (pp. 51 f.). According to his view, Vergil's opinion is composed of incoherent ideas; the thought expressed in these three verses is foreign to the original conception; furthermore, there is no parallel to the assumption that the souls of the pious are to be purified in Elysium. Stettner does not explain how the tradition should, then, be understood. After Norden's interpretation of the text (*P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI* [1926], pp. 16 f.) the only pertinent argument lies in Stettner's stressing

that Norden does not cite any parallels to Vergil's statement. The Pindar passage (*Olympian*, II, 67-74) is not a parallel, as Norden himself, after Malten's objection, admitted in the second edition in one place (p. 19) although still retaining it as such elsewhere (p. 20)¹; Plato (*Gorgias*, 523 B-524 A; *Phaedrus*, 249 A; *Republic*, 614 C-615 A) does not mention Elysium either. Yet there is a parallel to Vergil's theory in Plutarch: in the myth *De facie in orbe lunae*, Plutarch says that the souls of the pious come to the moon (XXVIII, 943 D). There they are purified till there remains only reason which was bestowed on the human being by the sun (XXX, 944 E; XXVIII, 943 A). This process apparently takes place in the parts of the moon which face the sun, called by Plutarch Elysium (XXIX, 944 C). Even if one would not dare to accept the opinion of Vergil without having a parallel, there is, in view of this corresponding passage in Plutarch, no reason to alter the unanimous reading of the manuscripts.

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

W. BEDELL STANFORD. *Greek Metaphor (Studies in Theory and Practice)*. Oxford, B. Blackwell, 1936. Pp. 156.

In the first five chapters of his book Mr. Stanford examines ancient and modern theories of metaphor, at the same time stating his own thesis. The remaining two chapters present the application of this thesis, first to the question of basic meaning in Greek, and second, to Homer's use of metaphor. There is a short appendix on metaphor in Aeschylus. The author is to be commended for an able and provocative study in literary criticism to which he brings the point of view and technique of modern semasiology. However, he leaves much to be desired.

Ancient critics made definitions of metaphor, they classified its varieties, they held certain theories of its function, but, as the author sees it, their appreciation of its real value was in almost all cases inadequate and in some ridiculous. Aristotle, for example, is taken to task again for his attachment to *ἐπτατό ὀϊστός* (pp. 12, 138), because, says Mr. Stanford, there never was a time when arrows did not fly. The truth of this assertion is immediately clear to the semasiologist: that feathered arrows had been flying long before Homer; that in Homer's time all arrows flew; that therefore in the poet's employment of such a figure there is no change in meaning and no addition to meaning. It is this *intentional* change in meaning, deliberately brought about by the literary artist which is essential to all metaphor worth the name (p. 88). Such metaphors therefore

¹ He does the same in the edition of 1934.

as Homer's ὅπα λειρώσσαν (pp. 54, 57, 140) and Aeschylus' σάλπιγξ αὐτῇ πάντ' ἐκείν' ἐπέφλεγεν win the author's approval as conscious metaphors. There is no such thing as unconscious metaphor. Ancient and modern critics from Aristotle on, including Max Müller (with Cicero and Hermogenes of Tarsus as exceptional cases), we are shown, were virtually unaware of the effect of metaphor on meaning. Such was the "sheepish orthodoxy" of Aristotle's disciples.

"Poets alone preserve the primeval vitality of language (p. 58)," Mr. Stanford says. Some of that vitality of Greek which has been explained away by grammarians, philologists, and logicians he hopes to recapture in this study. The cause is certainly a good one, the thesis is good. The author's ideas are never dull. But from such vehemence of argument and high-handed treatment of earlier critics one might have expected a greater enlightenment than the brief and general application of the thesis brings forth. Native intelligence and some attention to context has, for example, taught us before now that: ἄνθος does not always = a flower (pp. 111-114); γελᾶν does not in every case = to laugh (pp. 114-117). Nor can one have much confidence in the laboratorial picture of a cautious Homer (in a sort of φροντιστήριον?) fixing the poetic connotations of words (p. 122). That Homer did use simile more than metaphor, that he was the poet of clarity, no one would care to deny. Moreover, the assertion may be true that Homer in a time when speech and language were in a state of flux carefully avoided metaphor in the interests of clarity. But that this is the explanation either of clarity or metaphor in Homer is not demonstrated to this reviewer's satisfaction. No consideration is given other points of view. Homer's audience, it is true, did not have that same richness of reference which we must suppose those had who listened to Aeschylus. But had the earlier one not another, perhaps different body of reference and of language, rich in its own way? Was not Homer the poet who knew "how to make use of the traditional," who sang to those who "knew the old by birthright" (M. Parry, *Cl. Ph.*, XXVIII [1933], pp. 42 f.)? He was not in any artificial sense a legislator of meaning but a poet of his time who, within his subject, within his medium, and in his fashion strove, as does every good poet including Aeschylus, to clarify his meaning.

The writing is sometimes obscure (pp. 17, 18), and sometimes unnecessarily harsh. Mr. Stanford might have been kinder to Müller's root, "brightness" (p. 82), in view of his own pleasure in the "brightness" of γελᾶν (p. 115). Finally, one can point to the use of simile in *Iliad*, XIV, 388-401 or IV 422-456, as achieving an intensity such as the author reserves for metaphor (p. 128).

ALISTER CAMERON.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Altheim (Franz). A History of Roman Religion. Translated by Harold Mattingly. New York, *Dutton*, 1938. Pp. xi + 548.

Arnholtz (Arthur). Studier i poetisk og musikalsk rytmik. Vol. I: Principielt. With a summary in German. Copenhagen, *Levin & Munksgaard*, 1938. Pp. 424. Kr. 15.

Bignone (Ettore). Studi sul pensiero antico. Naples, *Luigi Loffredo*, 1938. Pp. viii + 355. L. 15.

Boas (Henriette). Aeneas' Arrival in Latium. Observations on Legends, History, Religion, Topography and Related Subjects in Vergil, Aeneid VII, 1-135. Amsterdam, *N. V. Noordhollandsche Uitgevers-Mij.*, 1938. Pp. 260.

Βουρβερη (Κωστ. Ι.). ΑΙ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΑΙ ΓΝΩΣΕΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ. Α' ΒΑΡΒΑΡΙΚΑ. Athens, ΜΟΥΣΕΙΑΔΟΥ και ΜΑΡΔΑ, 1938. Pp. 160.

Celsus. De Medicina. Vols. II and III. Translated by W. G. Spencer. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1938. Pp. lxxvii + 649. (L. C. L.)

Clemen (Carl). Lukians Schrift über die syrische Göttin. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrich*, 1938. Pp. 57. RM. 2.10. (Reprinted from *Der Alte Orient*, XXXVII, 3-4.)

Ehrenberg (Victor). Alexander and the Greeks. (Translated by Ruth Fraenkel von Velsen.) Oxford, *Blackwell*, 1938. Pp. 110. 7s. 6d.

Fankhänel (Herbert). Verb und Satz in der lateinischen Prosa bis Sallust. Eine Untersuchung über die Stellung des Verbs. Berlin, *Junker und Dünnhaupt*, 1938. Pp. 273. RM. 10.

Gillespie (William Ernest). Vergil, Aratus and Others: The Weather-Sign as a Literary Subject. Princeton, *Edwards Bros.*, 1938. Pp. ix + 72. (Diss.)

Goodenough (Erwin R.). The Politics of Philo Judaeus, Practice and Theory. New Haven, *Yale Univ. Press*, 1938. Pp. xii + 348. \$3.75. (With a general bibliography of Philo by Howard L. Goodhart and Erwin R. Goodenough.)

Henry (Paul). Les États du Texte de Plotin. Paris, *Desclée de Brouwer et Cie*, 1938. Pp. xxviii + 426. (Études Plotiniennes I.)

Jaeger (Werner). Diokles von Karystos. Die Griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles. Berlin, *de Gruyter*, 1938. Pp. viii + 244.

Janssen (Harry). Kultur und Sprache. Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian. Nijmegen, *Dekker & van de Vegt*, 1938. Pp. xi + 265.

Laidlaw (W. A.). The Prosody of Terence, A Relational Study. London, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1938. Pp. vii + 138. \$1.95. (*St. Andrews Univ. Publications*, No. XL.)

Marg (Walter). Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung (Semonides, Homer, Pindar). Würzburg, *Konrad Triltsch*, 1938. Pp. 105.

Meritt (Benjamin Dean). Documents on Athenian Tribute. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1937. Pp. ix + 135.

Milne (H. J. M.) and Skeat (T. C.) with contributions by Douglas Cockerell. Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus. British Museum, printed by order of the Trustees, 1938. Pp. x + 112; 43 plates and 23 figures.

Nestle (Wilhelm). Der Friedensgedanke in der antiken Welt. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1938. Pp. 79. M. 1.25. (*Philologus*, Suppl. XXXI, Heft 1.)

Pfeiffer (Rudolf). Die Netzfischer des Aischylos und der Inachos des Sophokles. Zwei Satyrspiel-Funde. München, *Beck*, 1938. Pp. 63. (*Sitzungsber. der Bayer. Akad. der Wissen.*, 1938, Heft 2.)

Pohlenz (Max). Hippokrates und die Begründung der wissenschaftlichen Medizin. Berlin, *de Gruyter*, 1938. Pp. 120. RM. 6.

INDEX TO VOLUME LIX.

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Aeneid</i> VIII-X, The Chronology of,	135-144	CAPLAN, HARRY. Review of Wall's A Medieval Latin Version of Demetrius' <i>De Elocutione</i> ,	113-115
Apollonius of Rhodes and the Old Geographers,	443-459	Carus, The Date of the Death of,	338-342
Aristotle, Laws of Motion in,	60-84	<i>Catalepton</i> VI and XII, The Subject of,	227-228
Athenian Calendar in 422/1 B. C., The Last Campaign of Kleon and the,	145-168	Census and Poll-Tax in Ptolemaic Egypt,	418-442
Augustus, Vergil, and the Augustan Elogia,	91-94	CHERNISS, HAROLD. Reviews: De Vogel's <i>Een Keerpunt in Plato's Denken</i> ,	237-240
Basilica, Maenianum and,	280-296	Gohlke's <i>Die Entstehung der aristotelischen Logik</i> ,	120-122
B. G. U. II, 475,	475-479	Grabmann's <i>Mittelalterliche Deutung und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre vom ΝΟΤΣ ΗΟΙΗΤΙΚΟΣ</i> ,	502
Books Received,		Witt's <i>Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism</i> ,	351-356
126-128, 255-256, 383-384,	507	Chronological (A) Problem: The Date of the Death of Carus,	338-342
BOWRA, C. M. Plato's Epigram on Dion's Death,	394-404	Chronology (The) of <i>Aeneid</i> VIII-X,	135-144
Xenophanes and the Olympic Games,	257-279	CLARK, CHARLES UPSON. Reviews: Battelli's <i>Lezioni di Paleografia</i> ,	382-383
BOYCE, ALINE ABAECHERLI. Review of Scott's <i>The Imperial Cult under the Flavians</i> ,	123-124	Pighi's <i>Nuovi Studi Ammiane</i> ,	254-255
BRAUNLICH, ALICE F. Reviews: Ercole's <i>Studi Giovenaliani</i> ,	124-125	Colloquial Pronunciation of <i>circumvenire</i> , An Old,	226-227
Löfstedt's <i>Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax</i> ,	242-244	Concerning Gothic Intransitive Verbs,	460-470
Svennung's <i>Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre</i> ,	503	COULTER, CORNELIA C. Review of Duff's <i>Roman Satire: Its Outlook on Social Life</i> ,	111-113
Breviora,	223-228	<i>Culex</i> Manuscript, An Unreported,	85-89
Caecilius Statius, The Nationality of the Poet,	301-308	De Attio et Praxidico: Plin., <i>N. H.</i> , XVIII, 200,	479-480
Caesar's Command, The Terminal Date of,	169-208	Dion's Death, Plato's Epigram on,	394-404
CALHOUN, GEORGE M. Reviews: Cloché's <i>Démosthènes et la fin de la démocratie athénienne</i> ,	97-99	DOW, STERLING. Review of Kirchner's <i>Inscriptiones Graecae, Voluminis II et III Editio Minor</i> ,	357-360
Gomme's <i>Essays in Greek History and Literature</i> ,	240-241		
CAMERON, ALISTER. Reviews: Stanford's <i>Greek Metaphor</i> ,	505-506		
Weter's <i>Encouragement of Literary Production in Greece from Homer to Alexander</i> ,	380-381		

	PAGE
DRABKIN, ISRAEL E. Notes on the Laws of Motion in Aristotle,	60-84
Dramatic Uses of the Greek Imperative,	31-59
DUCKWORTH, GEORGE E. The Chronology of <i>Aeneid</i> VIII-X,	135-144
EDELSTEIN, LUDWIG. Reviews: Boyancé's <i>Études sur le Songe de Scipion</i> ,	360-364
Labowsky's <i>Die Ethik des Panaitios</i> ,	99-102
Stettner's <i>Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern</i> ,	503-505
Elogia, Augustus, Vergil, and the Augustan,	91-94
Enslaved Persons Who Are Free,	1-30
FERGUSON, W. S. Review of Kahrstedt's <i>Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen</i> ,	229-237
FONTENROSE, JOSEPH E. Reviews: Daux' <i>Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle</i> ,	109-110
Daux' <i>Pausanias à Delphes</i> ,	110-111
FRÄNKEL, HERMANN. Heraclitus on the Notion of a Generation,	89-91
A Thought Pattern in Heraclitus,	309-337
Review of Reinach and Puech's <i>Alcée, Sapho</i> ,	494-497
FRANK, GRACE. Review of Rand's <i>A Toast to Horace</i> ,	255
FRANK, TENNEY. Augustus, Vergil, and the Augustan Elogia,	91-94
<i>Breviora</i> ,	223-228
Generation, Heraclitus on the Notion of a,	89-91
Geographers, Apollonius of Rhodes and the Old,	443-459
GOODENOUGH, ERWIN R. Review of Boyancé's <i>Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs</i> ,	487-490
Gothic Intransitive Verbs,	460-470
Greek Imperative, Dramatic Uses of the,	31-59
GREENE, WILLIAM C. Reviews: Busch's <i>Untersuchungen zum</i>	

	PAGE
Wesen der <i>τύχη</i> in den Tragödien des Euripides,	364-367
Dutoit's <i>Le Thème de l'adynaton dans la poésie antique</i> ,	244-245
HAMMOND, MASON. Review of von Premerstein's <i>Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats</i> ,	481-487
HANELL, KRISTER. Review of Apophoreta <i>Gotoburgensia Vilelmo Lundström oblata</i> ,	373-374
HEIDEL, W. A. Reviews: De Boer's <i>Galen De Propriorum Animi Cuiuslibet Affectuum Dignotione et Curatione</i> , etc.,	253-254
Wenkebach's <i>Galen in Hippocratis Epidemiarum Librum III</i> ,	253
Heraclitus on the Notion of a Generation,	89-91
Heraclitus, A Thought Pattern in,	309-337
Hipparcheum,	349-350
HYDE, WALTER WOODBURN. The Pentathlum Jump,	405-417
IG III (= CIA III), Appendix, 66,	346-348
Imperative, Dramatic Uses of the Greek,	31-59
Islands (The) of Peisistratos,	470-475
JOHNSON, ALLAN CHESTER. Review of Youtie's <i>Tax Rolls from Karanis</i> ,	369-370
JONES, LESLIE WEBBER. Review of Meagher's <i>The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières</i> ,	375-376
JONES, TOM B. A Chronological Problem: The Date of the Death of Carus,	338-342
Jurymen's Pay, Date of,	131-134
KEYES, CLINTON W. Review of Johnson's <i>Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian</i> ,	376-379
Kleon and the Assessment,	129-131
Kleon, The Last Campaign of, and the Athenian Calendar in 422/1 B. C.,	145-168
Kleon's Assessment, A Note on,	297-300

	PAGE		PAGE
KNIGHT, W. F. J. Review of Jenniston's The Greek Particles, 490-494		Notes on the Laws of Motion in Aristotle, 60-84	
KROLL, W. De Attio et Praxi- dico: Plin., <i>N. H.</i> , XVIII, 200, 479-480		Old English Glosses, Possible Elliptical Compounds in, 209-217	
Hipparcheum, 349-350		Olympic Games, Xenophanes and the, 257-279	
Plutarcheum, 348-349		PEARSON, LIONEL. Apollonius of Rhodes and the Old Geographers, 443-459	
LAISTNER, M. L. W. Review of Mynors' Cassiodori Sena- toris Institutiones, 115-117		Peisistratos, The Islands of, 470-475	
Last (The) Campaign of Kleon and the Athenian Calendar in 422/1 B. C., 145-168		Pentathlum (The) Jump, 405-417	
LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN, K. Mae- nianum and Basilica, 280-296		Plato's Epigram on Dion's Death, 394-404	
LEWIS, NAPHTALI. Reviews: Eitrem and Amundsen's Papyri Osloenses, Fasc. III, 371-373		Pliny, <i>N. H.</i> , XVIII, 200: De Attio et Praxidico, 479-480	
Holm's Griechisch-Ägyptische Namenstudien, 245-247		Plutarcheum, 348-349	
Livy's Deference to Livia, 223-224		Poll-Tax in Ptolemaic Egypt, Census and, 418-442	
Lucretius, V, 1442, A Gloss in the Text of, 225-226		Pompeii, A New Advertise- ment at, 224-225	
Lukrez, Zu einigen Wiederho- lungen bei, 218-223		Possible Elliptical Compounds in Old English Glosses, 209-217	
MCGREGOR, MALCOLM F. The Last Campaign of Kleon and the Athenian Calendar in 422/1 B. C., 145-168		Post, L. A. Dramatic Uses of the Greek Imperative, 31-59	
Maenianum and Basilica, 280-296		Review of Kuiper's Griek- sche Origineelen en Latijn- sche Navolgingen, 367-369	
MERRITT, BENJAMIN D. A Note on Kleon's Assessment, 297-300		POULTNEY, JAMES WILSON. Review of Koster's <i>Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine</i> , 125-126	
Review of Robert's Collec- tion Froehner: I, Inscrip- tions Grecques, 497-502		PRITCHETT, W. KENDRICK. A New Fragment of the Sarapion Monument, 343-345	
MERRITT, HERBERT. Possible El- liptical Compounds in Old English Glosses, 209-217		RAUBITSCHKE, A. Zu einigen Wiederholungen bei Lu- krez, 218-223	
Nationality (The) of the Poet Caecilius Statius, 301-308		REINHOLD, MEYER. Review of Goodfellow's Roman Citi- zenship, 117-119	
New (A) Fragment of the Sarapion Monument, 343-345		REVIEWS:	
New (The) Inscription of the Salaminiol, 385-393		Apophoreta Gotoburgensia Vilermo Lundström oblata, 373-374	
NILSSON, MARTIN P. The New Inscription of the Sala- miniol, 385-393		Battelli's Lezioni di Paleo- grafia, 382-383	
NOCK, ARTHUR DARBY. Review of Knight's Cumaeae Gates, 383		Benveniste's Origines de la formation des noms en in- doeuropéen, 95-97	
Note (A) on Kleon's Assess- ment, 297-300		Boyancé's Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs, 487-490	

	PAGE		PAGE
Boyancé's Études sur le Songe de Scipion,	360-364	zur Magistratur in Athen,	229-237
Busch's Untersuchungen zum Wesen der <i>τύχη</i> in den Tragödien des Euripides,	364-367	Kirchner's Inscriptiones Grae- cae, Voluminis II et III	
Cloché's Démosthènes et la fin de la démocratie athé- nienne,	97-99	Editio Minor,	357-360
Daux' Delphes au II ^e et au I ^{er} siècle depuis l'abais- sement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine, 191-31 av. J.-C.,	109-110	Knight's Cumaeae Gates,	383
Daux' Pausanias à Delphes,	110-111	Koster's Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine,	125-126
De Boer's Galeni De Pro- prium Animi Cuiuslibet Affectuum Dignotione et Curatione, etc.,	253-254	Kuiper's Grieksche Origin- eelen en Latijnsche Na- volgingen,	367-369
Denniston's The Greek Par- ticles,	490-494	Labowsky's Die Ethik des Panaitios,	99-102
De Vogel's Een Keerpunt in Plato's Denken,	237-240	Löfstedt's Vermischte Stu- dien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax,	242-244
Duff's Roman Satire: Its Outlook on Social Life,	111-113	Macurdy's Vassal-Queens and some Contemporary Wo- men in the Roman Em- pire,	379-380
Dutoit's Le Thème de l'ady- naton dans la poésie an- tique,	244-245	Meagher's The Gellius Manu- script of Lupus of Fer- rières,	375-376
Eitrem and Amundsen's Pa- pyri Osloenses, Fasc. III,	371-373	Mynors' Cassiodori Sena- toris Institutiones,	115-117
Ercole's Studi Giovenaliani,	124-125	Papers Presented to Sir Henry Stuart Jones: <i>Jour- nal of Roman Studies</i> , Vol. XXVII, 1937, Part I,	103-106
Gohlke's Die Entstehung der aristotelischen Logik,	120-122	Pighi's Nuovi Studi Am- mianeî; I Discorsi nelle Storie d'Ammiano,	254-255
Gomme's Essays in Greek History and Literature,	240-241	Pöschl's Römischer Staat und griechisches Staats- denken bei Cicero,	247-248
Goodfellow's Roman Citizen- ship. A Study of its Ter- ritorial and Numerical Expansion from the Ear- liest Times to the Death of Augustus,	117-119	Rand's A Toast to Horace,	255
Grabmann's Mittelalterliche Deutung und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre vom ΝΟΤΕ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΟΣ,	502	Reinach and Puech's Alcée, Sappho,	494-497
Holm's Griechisch-Ägypti- sche Namenstudien,	245-247	Robert's Collection Froeh- ner: I, Inscriptions Grec- ques,	497-502
Johnson's Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian,	376-379	Robinson's Pindar, A Poet of Eternal Ideas,	119-120
Kahrstedt's Untersuchungen		Rosenzweig's Ritual and Cults of Pre-Roman Igu- vium,	250-253
		Schulte's Orator, Untersuch- ungen über das ciceronia- nische Bildungsideal,	106-108
		Scott's The Imperial Cult under the Flavians,	123-124
		Stanford's Greek Metaphor,	505-506

	PAGE		PAGE
Stettner's Die Seelenwan- derung bei Griechen und Römern,	503-505	ungen über das ciceronia- nische Bildungsideal,	106-108
Stoessl's Die Trilogie des Aischylos,	122-123	STEVENS, C. E. The Terminal Date of Caesar's Com- mand,	169-208
Svennung's Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Laut- lehre,	503	STUKEY, HAROLD J. Review of van der Veer's Reiniging en Reinheid bij Plato,	381-382
Van der Veer's Reiniging en Reinheid bij Plato,	381-382	STURTEVANT, ALBERT MOREY. Concerning Gothic Intransi- tive Verbs,	460-470
Von Erffa's <i>Alôws</i> und ver- wandte Begriffe in ihrer Entwicklung von Homer bis Demokrit,	248-250	STURTEVANT, E. H. Review of Benveniste's Origines de la formation des noms en indoeuropéen,	95-97
Von Premierstein's Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzips,	481-487	TAYLOR, LILY ROSS. Review of Papers Presented to Sir Henry Stuart Jones,	103-106
Wall's A Medieval Latin Version of Demetrius' <i>De Elocutione</i> ,	113-115	Terminal (The) Date of Cae- sar's Command,	169-208
Wenkebach's Galeni in Hip- pocratis Epidemiarum Li- brum III,	253	Theopompos, <i>Philippika</i> , X, Two Notes on,	129-134
Weter's Encouragement of Literary Production in Greece from Homer to Alexander,	380-381	Thought (A) Pattern in Hera- clitus,	309-337
Witt's Albinus and the His- tory of Middle Platonism,	351-356	Two Notes on Theopompos, <i>Philippika</i> , X,	129-134
Youtie's Tax Rolls from Karanis,	369-370	Unreported (An) <i>Culex</i> Manu- script,	85-89
ROBATHAN, D. M. An Unre- ported <i>Culex</i> Manuscript,	85-89	Vergil, Augustus and the Au- gustan Elogia,	91-94
ROBERTSON, D. S. Review of Robinson's Pindar, A Poet of Eternal Ideas,	119-120	WADE-GERY, H. T. The Islands of Peisistratos,	470-475
ROBERTSON, H. G. Review of von Erffa's <i>Alôws</i> und ver- wandte Begriffe in ihrer Entwicklung von Homer bis Demokrit,	248-250	Two Notes on Theopompos, <i>Philippika</i> , X,	129-134
ROBSON, D. O. The National- ity of the Poet Caecilius Statius,	301-308	WALLACE, SHERMAN LEROY. Census and Poll-Tax in Ptolemaic Egypt,	418-442
Salaminiol, The New Inscrip- tion of the,	385-393	WELLES, C. BRADFORD. Review of Macurdy's Vassal- Queens and some Contem- porary Women in the Roman Empire,	379-380
Sarapion Monument, A New Fragment of the,	343-345	WESTERMANN, WILLIAM L. Enslaved Persons Who Are Free,	1-30
SCHLESINGER, ALFRED CARY. Review of Stoessl's Die Tri- logie des Aischylos,	122-123	WHATMOUGH, J. Review of Rosenzweig's Ritual and Cults of Pre-Roman Igu- vium,	250-253
SOLMSEN, FRIEDRICH. Reviews: Pöschl's Römischer Staat und griechisches Staats- denken bei Cicero,	247-248	Xenophanes and the Olympic Games,	257-279
Schulte's Orator, Untersuch-		YOUTIE, HERBERT C. B.G.U. II, 475,	475-479
		IG III (= CIA III), Ap- pendix, 66,	346-348
		Zu einigen Wiederholungen bei Lukrez,	218-223

SEP 20 1938

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

VOL. LIX, 4

WHOLE No. 236

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by
TENNEY FRANK

With the coöperation of
HAROLD CHERNISS (assistant editor), KEMP MALONE
BENJAMIN DEAN MERITT, DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

OCTOBER, 1938

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The New Inscription of the Salaminioi. By MARTIN P. NILSSON, -	385
Plato's Epigram on Dion's Death. By C. M. BOWRA, -	394
The Pentathlum Jump. By WALTER WOODBURN HYDE, -	405
Census and Poll-Tax in Ptolemaic Egypt. By SHERMAN LEROY WALLACE, -	418
Apollonius of Rhodes and the Old Geographers. By LIONEL PEARSON, -	443
Concerning Gothic Intransitive Verbs. By ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT, -	460
The Islands of Peisistratos. By H. T. WADE-GERY, -	470
B. G. U. II, 475. By H. C. YOUTIE, -	475
De Attio et Praxidico: Plin., N. H., XVIII, 200. By W. KROLL, -	479
REVIEWS: -	481
<i>Von Premierstein's Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats</i> (MASON HAMMOND).— <i>Boyancé's Le culte des Muses chez</i> <i>les philosophes grecs</i> (ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH).— <i>Dennis-</i> <i>ton's The Greek Particles</i> (W. F. J. KNIGHT).— <i>Reinach</i> <i>and Puech's Alcée, Sapho</i> (HERMANN FRÄNKEL).— <i>Robert's</i> <i>Collection Froehner: I, Inscriptions Grecques</i> (B. D. MERITT).— <i>Grabmann's Mittelalterliche Deutung</i> <i>und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre vom NOTE</i> <i>ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΟΣ nach einer Zusammenstellung im Cod. B III</i> <i>22 der Universitätsbibliothek Basel</i> (HAROLD CHERNISS).— <i>Svennung's Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre</i> (ALICE F. BRAUNLICH).— <i>Stettner's Die Seelenwanderung</i> <i>bei Griechen und Römern</i> (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN).— <i>Stan-</i> <i>ford's Greek Metaphor</i> (ALISTER CAMERON).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, -	507
INDEX, -	508

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor Tenney Frank, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

EDITED BY DAVID M. ROBINSON

1. THE ROMAN TOGA. By Lillian M. Wilson. 132 pages. 102 illustrations. \$3.00.
2. THE HISTORY AND CIVILIZATION OF ANCIENT MEGARA. By E. L. Highbarger. 234 pages. 6 illustrations. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.
3. ANCIENT SICYON WITH A PROSOPOGRAPHIA SICYONIA. By Charles H. Skalet. 234 pages. 17 illustrations. \$2.50.
4. THE NEGRO IN GREEK AND ROMAN CIVILIZATION: A STUDY OF THE ETHIOPIAN TYPE. By Grace Hadley Beardsley. 154 pages. 24 illustrations. \$3.50.
5. LES CULTES DE PATRAS: AVEC UNE PROSOPOGRAPHIE PATRÉENNE. By Jules Herbillon. 199 pages. \$3.00.
6. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART I. THE NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT. By George E. Mylonas. 126 pages. 96 plates. \$7.50.
7. THE GREEK TRADITION IN SCULPTURE. By Walter R. Agard. 70 pages. 34 illustrations. \$3.00.
8. ANCIENT CORINTH, WITH A TOPOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE CORINTHIA. PART I. FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO 404 B.C. By J. G. O'Neill. 270 pages. 9 plates and large folded plan of excavations. \$5.00.
9. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART II. ARCHITECTURE AND SCULPTURE. By DAVID M. ROBINSON. 177 pages. 315 illustrations. \$20.00.
10. PAPYRI IN THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY COLLECTIONS. Edited by Allan Chester Johnson and Henry Bartlett Van Hoesen. 169 pages. \$7.50.
11. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART III. THE COINS FOUND AT OLYNTHUS. By David M. Robinson. 143 pages. 28 plates. \$10.00.
12. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART IV. THE TERRA-COTTAS FOUND AT OLYNTHUS. By David M. Robinson. 119 pages. 62 plates. \$10.00.
13. SCULPTURED PORTRAITS OF GREEK STATESMEN: WITH A SPECIAL STUDY OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT. By Elmer G. Suhr. 202 pages. 21 plates. \$4.50.
14. HELLENISTIC QUEENS: A STUDY OF WOMAN-POWER IN MACEDONIA, SELEUCID SYRIA, AND PTOLEMAIC EGYPT. By Grace Harriet Macurdy. 265 pages. 12 plates. \$4.00.
15. EARLY CIVILIZATION IN THESSALY. By Hazel D. Hansen. 222 pages. 178 illustrations. \$4.00.
16. OLD AGE AMONG THE ANCIENT GREEKS. By Bessie Ellen Richardson. 391 pages. 16 plates. \$4.00.
17. A HISTORY OF OLYNTHUS. By Mabel Gude. 122 pages. \$2.50.
18. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART V. MOSAICS, VASES, AND LAMPS OF OLYNTHUS FOUND IN 1928 and 1931. By David M. Robinson. 320 pages. 209 plates. \$15.00.
19. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART VI. THE COINS FOUND AT OLYNTHUS IN 1931. By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. 30 plates. \$10.00.
20. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART VII. THE TERRA-COTTAS OF OLYNTHUS FOUND IN 1931. By David M. Robinson. 123 pages. 61 plates. \$10.00.
21. PINDAR: A POET OF ETERNAL IDEAS. By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. \$3.00.
22. VASSAL-QUEENS AND SOME CONTEMPORARY WOMEN UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By Grace H. Macurdy. 160 pages. 6 plates. \$3.00.
23. A STUDY OF THE GREEK LOVE-NAMES, INCLUDING A DISCUSSION OF PAEDERASTY AND A PROSOPOGRAPHIA. By David M. Robinson and Edward J. Fluck. 212 pages. 1 plate. \$3.00.
24. THE CLOTHING OF THE ANCIENT ROMANS. By Lillian M. Wilson. 191 pages. 118 illustrations. \$5.00.
25. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART VIII. THE HELLENIC HOUSE. By David M. Robinson and J. Walter Graham. 391 pages. 36 figures and 111 plates. \$15.00.
26. EXCAVATIONS AT OLYNTHUS. PART IX. THE CHALCIDIC MINT AND THE EXCAVATION COINS FOUND IN 1928-1934. By David M. Robinson and Paul Augustus Clement. 446 pages. 36 plates. \$15.00.
27. THE APE IN ANTIQUITY. By William C. McDermott. 349 pages. 10 plates. \$5.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome

ALREADY ISSUED:

- I. *Rome and Italy of the Republic*. By TENNEY FRANK. 445 pages, \$3.00. Now available only if complete set is ordered.
- II. *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*. By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON. 742 pages, \$4.00.
- III. *The Four Western Provinces*. By R. G. COLLINGWOOD; J. J. VAN NOSTRAND; V. M. SCRAMUZZA; and ALBERT GRENIER. 672 pages. \$4.00.

Now ready.

- IV. *Roman Africa*, by R. M. HAYWOOD, 120 pp.
Roman Syria, by F. M. HEICHELHEIM, 133 pp.
Roman Greece, by J. A. O. LARSEN, 240 pp.
Roman Asia, by T. R. S. BROUGHTON. 420 pp.
Indices. 950 pages, \$5.00.

- V. *Italy of the Empire* (forthcoming).

ARISTOTLE'S CRITICISM OF PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

By HAROLD CHERNISS. 432 pages, \$4.00.

THE SYNTAX OF THE GENITIVE CASE IN ARISTOPHANES

By JAMES WILSON POULTNEY. 250 pages, \$3.50.

SELECTIONS FROM THE BRIEF MENTION OF BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

Edited with a biographical sketch and an index by CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. 546 pages, frontispiece, \$4.50.

STUDIES IN HONOR OF HERMANN COLLITZ

By American and foreign scholars. 341 pages, frontispiece, \$5.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

